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PREFACE

In its early stages of development in the United States, social work consisted both of helping people directly and of involving them in action to improve their living environment and promote social justice. Social work has continued to espouse its commitment to changes in social conditions, and it exercises initiative along this line through its professional organization at the national and state levels. Most practitioners, however, are engaged in work with individuals, and relatively few are directly involved in the facilitating of social change.

Without in any way discounting the importance of individualized services, this researcher is concerned about limited emphasis placed by social work on enabling client groups to participate in policy decision-making. Except for the antipoverty years, social work has not very aggressively addressed this potential for dealing with human needs and problems. There is no profession for which this is as much the proper function as social work. It is from this perspective that this project has been completed.

An approach has not yet been formed that provides continuous, really meaningful influence of minority groups in local policy and planning development. Through a research interest in the subject, perhaps social work can contribute to this end.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Study Purpose and Scope

In general terms the purpose of this study is to examine the concept of citizen participation in its relation to the changing pattern of federalism. A major phenomenon of the United States has been the increased emphasis on the participation of citizens in national, state, and local affairs. Although the concept of citizen participation is broad, involving a wide range of settings and situations, much of the development has occurred in the context of federal programs. Citizen participation has emerged as a prominent feature of federal public policy. Its character and prevalence varies, but the prevailing view is that it has become an institutionalized element of government and will persist for the foreseeable future. Thus, investigation of it is timely and appropriate.

This study will be concerned specifically with citizen participation as an official part of federal programs. Much of the literature has defined the term within this framework. An example is Langton, who says "Citizen participation refers to purposeful activities in which citizens take part in relation to government."¹ In such programs, the participation features have been permissible, more commonly they have been mandated. A distinction has been noted between "legislated" and "spontaneous" participation.²
Certain provisions for participation, such as technical and administrative boards and commissions, have long been a traditional part of government operations. As a recent development, citizen participation consists of structure and activity that are separate from the traditional provisions.

Within these limits, citizen participation is most commonly used as an inclusive term that covers a number of different specific patterns. These patterns reflect variations in who the participants are (such as consumers, clients, constituents, or parents) and how their role is perceived (such as "action" or "involvement").

The concept has been applied to programs at all three levels of government. However, the most common application has been at the local level.

For purposes here, citizen participation is defined as "any formal local program the purpose of which is wholly or partially to fulfill the requirements of a federal program for citizen input into decision-making beyond the regular basic governmental organization, including programs variously referred to in requirements by such terms as 'consumer participation', 'citizen involvement', and 'client participation'." Since the subject of this study is a federal program related to local government, much of the discussion in the paper concerns citizen participation which has as its object the influencing of an elected local governing body. However, the assumptions and principles would to a large extent be applicable to other governing bodies, such as those of voluntary agencies. The chief difference is the election of governmental governing bodies, compared with the appointment or self selection of others.
Although there were earlier federal requirements for citizen involvement, the term citizen participation came into widespread use following the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964,\(^3\) which came early in the Great Society administration of President Lyndon Johnson. The period was marked by rapid growth of federal programs. Between 1962 and 1966, the number of federal categorical grant programs increased from 160 to 349, and by 1977 the number was about 500.\(^4\) Citizen participation became a frequent requirement in the new programs. With the move toward the New Federalism of President Richard Nixon in the early 1970's, the emphasis was on the reduction of categorical programs. The citizen participation requirement persisted, however, and in 1978 the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identified 155 programs that had such provisions, 124 of which were enacted after 1970.\(^5\)

Briefly, federalism in this context is the distribution of power and resources by the federal government to state and local governments. The categorical federal programs of the 1960's and earlier directed funding to specific state or local projects under conditions of strong regulation by the federal government. Beginning in the early 1970's, there was a move toward channeling funds to the other levels of government for much less specific purposes and with substantially less federal control. A number of results of the change were predicted, and these are discussed later in this paper. Among them was the belief expressed that revenue-sharing, as the new approach was labeled, would (a) enhance citizen participation, because it would increase the role of general-purpose local government, which is more directly responsible to the electorate, and would reduce the role of more isolated
special-purpose agencies, (b) result in an increase of special interest groups, and (c) bring about a restructuring of local government units toward greater responsiveness.

One of the revenue-sharing programs is the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program, enacted as Title I of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1974. It provides funding to local communities under conditions of wide discretion in the use of the funds for housing and community development. It stipulates that most of the funds are to serve the low- and moderate-income population. In its original form, it required that there be citizen participation in the local allocation of CDBG funds which was to be advisory, was to consist of a minimum of two public hearings, was to involve both the low-income and the citizens of the community as a whole, and was to otherwise allow wide latitude for local determination of the form and other specifics.

Because it placed community development policy-making in the general-purpose area of local government and therefore closer to the electorate, there were, as cited above, those who believed it had the potential for restructuring government in the direction of greater responsiveness to citizen interests, and that the citizen participation channels would have increased importance as the articulators of these interests. The implications of community response to the legislation are substantial. Relevant questions are these: Did citizen interest and influence come? Toward what goals was the influence directed? What in the character of the citizen participation accounted for the results?

In Wichita, Kansas, the citizen participation requirement was met in large part through the establishment of an advisory structure,
the Citizen Participation Organization (CPO). Using a case study approach, this study examined the CPO in terms of relevant theoretical concepts and dimensions. The goal was to determine the impact of the revenue-sharing approach on citizen participation requirements and the implementation of them. The accomplishment of this involved a review of the legislative history to determine the intent, this to provide a basis of comparison in relation to fulfillment of legislative objectives. Further, the program was considered from the standpoint of its accomplishment of social work objectives.

Review of the literature during the course of study revealed a number of attempts to develop a single, common definition and conceptualization for citizen participation. Numerous, widely varying typologies appear in the literature, and no substantial agreement has been reached on the definition and nature of the concept. At the same time, most studies of the impact of citizen participation have concluded that it has been relatively ineffective in accomplishment of specified objectives. It appears to this writer that what has been treated as a single phenomenon is in fact two quite different concepts, and that failure to make the distinction has accounted for the mixed results. In other words, citizen participation experiences often appear to have been funded in terms of activities and objectives that were not appropriate to the particular instance. Consequently, during the course of the study two paradigms evolved which are discussed in Chapter III. The case study served to test the two-paradigm idea, as well as to investigate the fulfillment of intent and objectives in terms of the paradigm represented by the CPO.
The themes summarized thus far are developed more fully throughout the remainder of the paper.

**Early Historical Context**

The turbulence of the 1960's and the resulting federal response are generally considered to have been caused by deep-seated, pent-up political, economic, and social forces. The period was marked by high levels of citizen frustration and distrust of traditional institutions. A state of anomie had emerged from what had become a mechanistic society. In order to counter this, as well as to incorporate citizen values and judgments into decision-making into resulting programs, citizen participation was made an integral part of many of the programs.

In contrast to earlier federal social program initiatives, which were directed toward the alleviation of immediate need, many of the Great Society programs focused on root causes which required basic changes in the social structure. According to Tumin, "most problems facing communities arise from the very nature of their social structure and culture patterning, and are to be seen as natural pathologies of these systems. Any genuine solution to such problems therefore is likely to involve some considerable reshuffling of the status quo." Warren notes a "great change" in American communities which involved changes in fundamental values, among them a gradual acceptance of governmental activity as a positive value in a number of fields, a gradual movement from a moral to a causal interpretation of human behavior and a change in community approaches to social problems from moral reform to planning. Neighborhood organizing has been attributed to an emerging new commitment to political and economic democracy,
in opposition to corporate control of people's lives and unresponsive
government. 10

In relation to programs beyond the local community, there were
influences in support of basic changes. According to Wolins, "Social
welfare is a device for maintaining or strengthening the existing so­
cial structure of an industrial society." Magill notes that humani­
tarian as opposed to individualistic orientations in which individuals
are held to be the cause, gradually became acceptable in social welfare
of the early twentieth century, but strong pressures were emerging to
return to the individualistic. Developments in the Great Society era
were reactions to these forces. Stearns and Montag relate the situ­
tion to "the closed system economy of the future which is a radical de­
parture from historical trends. This reorientation has the potential
to shift social concern from the quantity of production to the quality
of human experience." 13

In the context of these forces, such developments as the civil
rights movement and opposition to intervention in Vietnam triggered
federal action at a level unmatched since the New Deal era. Among pro­
grams that emerged from various legislative actions were, for example,
Community Action, Head Start, Older Americans Act programs, Comprehen­
sive Health Services, Model Cities, Elementary and Secondary Education
Action Title I projects, and Law Enforcement Assistance Act projects.
The programs established pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of
1964 were specifically identified as "war on poverty" or "antipoverty"
programs, and in a more general sense most of the programs emerging in
the Great Society period were collectively associated with those terms.
Their purpose was to open up economic and political opportunities, and
to bring into the social mainstream those in the population who were
dependent and powerless.

The provisions for citizen participation in most of the new pro-
grams were a reflection of their purposes and the conditions from which
they emerged. Warren, et al., views the period as one of urban reform,
and states that programs such as Community Action and Model Cities were
part of a deliberate effort to get responsiveness from social welfare
agencies through the use of pressure groups. While Moynihan and
others concluded that some of the resulting activity, particularly in
relation to Community Action, were based on a misunderstanding of legis-

alative intent, the avowed and perceived expectation from most citizen
participation efforts was to introduce new citizen influence into
decision-making. One reason was the climate of broad citizen unrest
out of which the programs emerged. Another reason was the assumption
that changes at the basic level of projected social change could come
about only through strong citizen action.

While observers of Great Society programs have noted some accom-
plishments, the general view is that they failed in combatting poverty
and introducing institutional changes. Warren, et al., concluded that
the programs "played themselves out" and were ineffective. The pro-
grams, the researchers believe, "succeeded admirably" in reducing dis-
sent, but they didn't provide the leverage to move many people out of
poverty. They attribute the failure to social welfare agencies which
continued to make the rules according to their own needs rather than
the needs of clients, and to the tenets of liberal reform, which chooses
social services as an alternative to changes in income distribution.
Gil cites the futility of efforts such as Community Action and Model Cities to obtain fundamental changes. He holds that the prevailing belief of the population is that "existing social, political, and economic system . . . are sound, and that therefore policy reform should not concern itself with elements of the society." Thus, he says, we deal with isolated symptoms in such areas as housing, health, and education, and on the rationale that poor people are lazy, we focus on changing individuals "rather than the social reality with which they are confronted." 17

Pearl says the failure of the war on poverty had been attributed to faulty conceptualization, incompetent administration, inadequate funding, and uncommitted national leadership. "In reality, when substance was separated from sloganeering, the War on Poverty was a hodge-podge of legislative proposals, most of which had been rattling around Congress since World War II." 18

Another view is provided by Peterson, who blames the failure on the federal system. His explanation, which is discussed more thoroughly in Chapter IV of this thesis, is that the local government plays a different role than the federal government, and that insofar as the local governments were involved in the programs, they could not share the federal commitment. Because local governments are influenced primarily by economic growth considerations, they favor "hard" federal dollars for things such as sewers and downtown renewal. The Great Society consisted primarily of "soft" programs of such things as better education, improved health care, and more political power. Peterson maintains that local officials perceived that, because these programs made their communities more attractive for lower-income citizens, they caused
these citizens to gravitate to the communities, placing demands on local services. While local governments accepted the federal funds because of their short-term positive effects of the economy, they tended to modify any redistributive effects of the programs.\textsuperscript{19}

In still another vein, Kettl said the Great Society programs failed because of two problems. First, the administrative process for channeling funds was clogged by gross inefficiencies, including such things as lack of coordination and unrealistic planning requirements. Second, the grant system produced a serious political imbalance, subjugating state and local governments, and diffused the focus of accountability.\textsuperscript{20}

Hampden-Turner says that the Community Action and Model Cities programs did not have realizable goals. There was, he states, a reluctance to institutionalize and incorporate the alternative structures that were necessary.\textsuperscript{21}

Other factors have been blamed for contributing to the programs' failure are conservative local elites, inherent complexities of intergovernmental programs, and differential constituencies.\textsuperscript{22} There is substantial reporting of research which suggests that there was little change in social welfare agencies or redistribution of power or resources.\textsuperscript{23}

There were some different judgments. Papers prepared for the Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin suggest that there were effective programs, including Community Action and those dealing with medical care and legal services. Programs that were judged to be mixed in their results were those concerned with income maintenance and antidiscrimination in employment and housing.
Education and training were found not to have accomplished anything toward increased incomes of the poor. Nevertheless, the preponderance of research concludes that the programs did not realize expectations, and were relatively ineffective in terms of their objectives. The significance here is that, considering their strong emphasis on citizen participation, the programs' failure suggests the failure of their citizen participation components. As discussion later in this thesis indicates, the judgments about the impact of citizen participation have been both positive and negative, depending upon a number of variables. Even where the findings have been negative, writers have generally concluded that citizen participation has potential to justify continuing support for it. It can be reasonably suggested that, given some of the causes cited above which were not inherently related to the citizen participation, the participation might be more successful in another context. In fact, Warren, et al., attribute the ineffectiveness of citizen participation to the fact that the services influenced by the participation in the urban reform period contributed nothing to moving people out of poverty. Programs of the New Federalism period, of which the subject of this research is one, provide an opportunity to examine this.

**Social Policy Content**

Although there are other goals of citizen participation that are discussed in Chapter II, such as education and therapy, the most commonly held manifest goal is that of influencing social policy. Some definitions of social policy are contained in the following statements:
The development of, from an administrative sense, the manner in which the manpower resources of a group are to be allocated for the construction, implementation, or evaluation of programs or plans, or from a programmatic sense, the way programs are to be structured to resolve problems or achieve goals . . .

Broadly, social policy is concerned with the structure of society; relationships between individuals, groups, and larger society, and governs the distribution of resources among members of the society . . .

Social policy is the implicit or explicit core of principles or continuing line of decisions and constraints underlying specific social welfare programs and provisions . . . The development of social policy is a political process based on conflict among interest groups and contests among citizens. In a democracy, at least in theory, policy reflects public opinion and the will of the people. According to Gil, "The common domain of all social policies can . . . be identified as the overall quality of living of individuals and groups, and the nature of intra-societal human relations." He proceeds to discuss, however, the difficulties of defining "quality of life."

Fagence says that the policy outcomes of citizen participation depends on two key concepts—representation and the public interest. The first of these is discussed in Chapter III of this dissertation. In regard to the second, the public interest, he says there is a "conceptual muddle," but he identifies three theories. The first is the individual interests theory, which holds that the principal purpose of government is to maximize individual self-interests; the second in the group interests theory, which contends that society is composed of groups of interests, and it is the function of public officials to "attune" these into policies; and the third is the public interests
theory, which focuses on a "higher level" in the hierarchy of interests.  

Gilbert and Specht identify three conceptions of the public interest; (1) the organismic, in which "there is an ideal public interest that transcends the specific preferences and interests of the individuals of which the public body is composed", (2) the communalist, in which "there is a unitary public interest composed of the interests that all the public share in common," and (3) the individualist, in which "there is no unitary public interest, only different publics with different interests." They point out that in the Model Cities programs, the different patterns of relationships among planners, political leadership, and citizen groups tended to be associated with ways in which the public interest was defined. Further, they identify it as a basic philosophical issue that separates those who favor centralized, comprehensive planning from those who favor decentralized, fragmented planning.

Another conceptualization of public interest is that of unitary versus pluralist. Judd and Mendelson stated in 1973 regarding planning that the proposition that the public interest is unitary has come under sustained questioning in the last few years.

Although it incorporates rational considerations, the public interest is ultimately an expression of values. It is important that action goals be consistent with the values of citizens and the common good. Gil points out the importance of uncovering "value premises and ideological orientations underlying ... policy objectives.

The action through which the public interest becomes articulated is decision-making, which has been defined as a "rudimentary form of
compromise, trade-offs, sharing, etc., in order to attain a particular objective . . . 38 This definition is applicable here for decisions of the citizen participation mechanism, but in the case of a governing body, decision-making consists of formal actions.

For consideration in relation to citizen participation, the important point here is that social policy is the articulation of the public interest, which is ultimately an expression of citizen values. The values that become reflected in policy are determined by the conception of public interest and the decision-making process that exists. Citizen participation is effective when it has made an impact on the values incorporated in policy, and thus it is related to the way the public is conceived and decisions are made. This is discussed further in Chapter III.

Gil notes that some "social scientists suggest that a tendency to fragmentation, parochialism, and incrementalism in the development of social policies is an intrinsic aspect of democracy in a complex and pluralistic society, and that it therefore could not be eliminated entirely, although its scope could be reduced." He rejects "such a narrow conception of democracy and of human potential." 39 Citizen participation is an aspect of democracy to which fragmentation and incrementalism are attributed, but, as will be discussed later, there are models which have overcome this.

Henderson notes that the disinterested champion of the public interest is often the recipient of financial and other penalties, and that citizens more readily participate in behalf of special interests. However, there are satisfactions in such things as knowledge and promotion of social justice that for many provide the needed motivation. 40
A basic issue of social policy is the redistribution of resources. Kahn has pointed out that society must rely on redistribution of income, power, and property, rather than the expansion of the economy, to solve basic social problems. Arguments in support of redistribution as a social service and policy objective appear in numerous places in the literature, including Rein, Cloward and Piven, Kahn, and Davidoff. Redistribution, it is reported, has become a major theme in social welfare literature.

Redistribution addresses the basic values and fabric of society. Gil identifies three universal, interrelated processes by which human societies shape the quality of life: resource development, division of labor, and rights distribution. The nature and problems of redistribution of rights to income and goods is a political reality. Advocacy for some produces deprivation for others.

Haveman identifies three paths to fighting poverty: transfer payments, changing the poor, and changing society. Because the first was too expensive and the third was too revolutionary, the second was the dominant theme of antipoverty programs. Theoretically, redistribution could be achieved through any of the three. Many writers, however, cite the need for the third in order to make substantial impact. An example is Brager and Specht, who contend that poverty is not a result of insufficient skill on the part of individuals, but is maldistribution of resources due to imbalance of power in the community.

Warren, et al., identify some problems encountered by the urban reform movement to achieve redistribution. One is the ambiguity of the concept. Another is the fact that changes that will affect poverty "are principally changes in the state or structure of the national
Achievements in reducing poverty were due to changes in the national economy, the authors state, rather than locally-operated federally-financed programs.

Thus, important policy issues have been redistribution versus economic expansion as the means of combatting poverty, individual vs. societal change as the approach for achieving the change, and the local versus the national level as the effective point for policy-making and action. The courses that are chosen for these are related to the conception of the public interest that prevails, and the role and impact of citizen participation are thereby affected.

The State of Citizen Participation

As indicated earlier, citizen participation appears to have become a matter of long-range importance in public policy. Writing and research about the subject exploded during the decade beginning with the antipoverty war in 1964. The numerous programs requiring citizen participation and the availability of federal funding for monitoring and study made federal domestic programs a fruitful source for theoretical considerations and research.

The writing and research during this period focused on such things as (1) the extent to which and conditions under which citizen participation programs fulfilled different functions, (2) the variables which determined the extent to which citizen participation programs were introduced, (3) the relationship between strategies and goal achievements, (4) the characteristics of participants, (5) the relationship of various factors to participant satisfaction, and (6) the relationship of various factors to the degree of impact. Most of the research concerned studies
of citizen participation in the content of the antipoverty programs (Model Cities more than any other), and the validity of their findings in the context of current circumstances may vary. Nevertheless, reference is made in this thesis to previous findings where they are relevant and appear to be justified. In addition to research, much of the literature dealt with development of typologies for use in study of the subject, and these are used in this study.

The literature on citizen participation dropped sharply in the last half of the 1970's. Although citizen participation was carried over in many programs and was included in some newly enacted programs, such as the CDBG program, it clearly did not have the prominence in federal policy that it did earlier. The interest in investigation of the subject dwindled. Although a change in the federal administration with the election of President Jimmy Carter prompted a brief revival of governmental interest about 1978, the decline resumed under President Ronald Reagan. An example is the CDBG program, for which virtually all citizen participation provisions were removed in 1981. At the same time, Congress maintained the citizen participation requirement in the Community Action Program, now a part of Community Services Block Grant funding, but it was considerably weakened.

Nevertheless, there continues to be a persistent interest in the subject. Among additions in recent years to the literature are contributions in, for example, Fagence, Kramer and Specht, editors, Hooyman, Kweit and Kweit, Langton, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The recent literature tends to be largely descriptive and concept-building in nature, rather than the research of the antipoverty era. It reflects the view that, although the emphasis
will vary with the transitory political philosophies of those in power, the conditions that fostered the growth of participation requirements have not changed, and that citizen participation will continue as an element of federal policy over the long range.

This position is supported by the broadly held view that citizen participation has become institutionalized. This view, expressed by Kitzmuller and Ottinger and Powers around the end of the antipoverty thrust, has been reiterated more recently by Marshall, Burke, and the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Spiegel predicts that participation "will not rest" in the 1980's, but will take on two distinct forms, one which is autonomous and sponsored by the grass roots, and the other which is sponsored and sanctioned by government.

The recent literature has tended to treat citizen participation as less action-oriented than was true earlier. However, there are still among writers some proponents of aggressive grass-roots organizing and political advocacy.

Most governmental fostering of citizen participation has occurred almost entirely at the federal level. There have been few instances in which local governments have instigated or officially recognized participation that was not federally mandated, and a survey of state and local programs shows considerably less emphasis than is true of federal programs. This corresponds to a much more limited role of local and state governments in redistributive programming than of the federal government. During the period from 1962 to 1973, the per cent of the federal domestic budget allocated to redistributive purposes rose from 47 to 55, whereas the local government increase was only slight, from
12.9 to 13.8 per cent.69

Social Work, Citizen Participation, and Revenue-Sharing

The association between the profession of social work and citizen participation is set forth in two provisions of the Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers, which says, "The social worker should make every effort to foster maximum self-determination on the part of clients" and "the social worker should encourage informed participation by the public in shaping social policies and institutions."70 This suggests that social work supports a participatory view of democracy in which clients and other citizens can make a meaningful impact on decisions that affect them.

The literature clearly supports the commitment of social work to democratic values. Included in the evidence are writings of Kendall,71 Lindeman,72 Pumphrey,73 Gordon,74 and Boehm.75

The By-Laws of the National Association of Social Workers say the purpose of the organization is "to further the broad objective of improving conditions of life in our democratic society through utilization of professional knowledge and skills of social work . . ."76

The literature is extensive in relation to the social work position that people should have the opportunity to fulfill their potential and should have the right and responsibility for doing so. Gordon says that the ultimate value in social work is "that it is good and natural for man to fulfill his potential, to realize himself, and to balance this with essentially equal efforts to help others fulfill their capacities and realize themselves.77 Bartlett connects the development of human potential and the support of democratic principle:
Because of the dependence of individual growth upon social relationship and social organization, social workers are committed to democratic principles and the rights of groups to function in such a society. An essential attribute of a democratic society is the realization of the full potential of each individual and the assumption of his social responsibility through active participation in society.

The commitment of social work to these values is important to its role in citizen participation in two respects. The first is that it places social work as a profession in support of social policy that provides opportunities for citizens to be involved in governmental decision-making, and suggests that it is the responsibility of social workers to actively defend and further such a policy. Second, it establishes citizen participation as an essential element of social work practice, especially in regard to community organization practice.

Social work in the United States is rooted in such early institutions as settlement houses. The programs included both the meeting of individual needs and efforts to change community conditions. Eventually the contents of practice evolved into three categories of process or method: casework, group work, and community organization. Casework gradually assumed a predominating role, and community organization grew to be characterized by emphasis on coordination of services and planning by community leaders. Some leaders in the profession became concerned about the movement away from social change. Bartlett and Kahn suggested a need for two distinct paths, one concerned with treatment of clients and another concerned with administration. The latter was to broaden involvement in planning, social policy, and program administration.
With the coming of the civil rights movement and the war on poverty in the 1960's, many social workers joined the ranks of those promoting institutional change. Bartlett describes the return to social reform:

Under the pressure of social change, the interest in social reform that characterized early social work and took the form of social action in later years returned with redoubled vigor. In the belief that the current system of social services was inadequate, some social workers pressed for efforts to change it radically at once... Many voices were heard urging that social work should speak out and give leadership on national issues...

Social work became divided between those who were clinically-oriented and those who identified the professional with an activist role. Kahn wrote:

Pervading the growing movement of social change were a deep-seated rejection and mistrust of established social welfare institutions. Many social workers became caught up in this mood. Direct confrontations with welfare agencies and organizations tended to radicalize significant elements in the social work community, particularly among young and minority workers...

...underlying the "practice-versus-action" split are far more basic issues: the concept of "service": the way in which those in need of service are perceived and the relationship of the professionals to them.

Otis wrote as follows:

The theory of liberty which is germane to the profession is that of modern liberalism. This takes two forms: (1) the concern of social work with the development and modification of institutional structure, and (2) the concern of social work with the development of methodologies which increase the "power to do" of individuals and groups.

Specht cautioned, however, that "Social work is not the major instrument for the political and economic reordering of society," and he concluded that social work is unsuited for political activism.
Of the early history of social work Gilbert and Specht say

The reformers associated with the settlement house movement based many of their programs on social action to promote social legislation for relieving the distress among the working classes. The Charity Organization Society movement represented the community's attempt to help individuals adjust to social situations by use of scientific helping processes; the reform spirit of the settlement movement represented the community's desire to change society to meet people's needs.

Grosser, one of the more assertive proponents of an advocacy role for social work, describes how social work, once a force to alter institutions, became a part of the institutional system.

The position of the National Association of Social Workers on the subject was enunciated by action of the Board of Directors in 1968:

... the professional social worker is ethically bound to take on the advocacy role if he is to fulfill his responsibilities. The ensuing obligation to the professional association is to protect the worker and to develop a program to advance the continuing education of social workers in the role as advocate.

Schools of social work expanded their programs in community organization, and community intervention became a major activity of the profession. Social workers were admonished to prepare low-income citizens to compete for resources in the political arena, and were advised that allocations of resources for the poor would be low unless supported by strong interest groups. Professionals were distinguished from bureaucrats on the basis of their defining their practice in terms of consumer, rather than bureaucratic, interests. Grosser, noting the association between the social reform movement and the shift from a residual to an institutional model of social work, said that

The institutional position does not preclude the altruistic and humanitarian practices that have
graced the social-work profession since its inception. Through such an interpretation and application of welfare history, the doctrines of partisanship, advocacy, social brokerage, clients as policymakers, and accountability through public ownership of welfare organizations can be reconciled with the professional ideals of social work and contemporary social-welfare needs. Since the end of the antipoverty thrust, the profession has retreated from the activist orientation, and community organization has descended in prominence. However, there are in the 1980's still some who hold that, in a period of national retreat from social justice, it is important that social work support such things as empowerment of minority communities and group self-determination.

Regarding the profession's commitment to change, Kahn says, "it is hard to operationalize large scale social change from a case-level function." Various models have been offered for linking casework to social action by Rein, Specht, Meyer, and others.

While the strong activist approach has declined in social work practice, the profession remains as an association of separate parts, rather than as integrated whole. Billups cites the need for the profession to become unified, and suggests that this be accomplished by "center-moving" in contrast to the existing "center-fleeing" tendency.

Gordon has made the point that if social workers are defined to be "the matchers of individuals and environments for maximum development," they are removed from "the dilemma of having to choose between the role of people adjuster or social change." Community development, which has been identified as a method of social work and is a concept with considerable support in social work theory, represents an intermediate strategy of social change. Although
it is not in all respects on a continuum between the social action and
the community organization model that is predominant in American social
work, it avoids extremes. In addition, it is, in the view of many, the
approach intended in the CDBG legislation. This is discussed further
in Chapter IV.

The recognition of community development as a method of social
work is extensively documented. Goetschius provides this definition:

Community development is a method of social work
through which community groups are helped by a worker
to use the social process, in order to achieve more
effective and efficient relationships. The method
finds and makes a contribution to group and commu­

nity life.101

Speigel says

From the perspective of social work, community
development may be regarded as a process of deliber­
erate intervention in the social network or local
structure of relations among people and organi­
zations for the purpose of changing or improving
patterns of social welfare and sociopolitical
functioning . . . Unlike social planning and social
policy formation, it suggests a characteristic
grass-roots or "bottom-up," rather than a "top-down"
approach . . . 102

Elizabeth Wickendon links social welfare and community develop­
ment by pointing out that social welfare consists of services "which
make individuals, groups, and communities better able to adapt to
the changes implicit in the developmental process."103

One other relationship that should be cited is that between social
work and urban planning. Mayer identifies the two with "efforts to
shape communities for the enhancement of human welfare . . ."104 While
both profess to involvement in social planning, they have traditionally
functioned with considerable independence of each other. This changed
during the antipoverty period, when emphasis was placed on both personal
and environmental factors, and on the interdependence of the two. At the same time that social work stressed an advocacy responsibility, the concept of advocacy planning which is discussed in more detail later, emerged. Programs such as Model Cities fostered linkages between social and urban planning.

All of the above discussion of changes in social work and the relationship to community development and urban planning are relevant to consideration of social work interest in citizen participation. Citizen participation is inherent in a process definition of community development, and urban planning has come to be characterized by opportunities for citizens to be involved. These relationships are important to social work in terms of both social work's concern for public policy and community work as an area of social work practice.

Social work possesses both the base and the skills to be supportive of citizen participation. As stated by Tucker, "social workers know better than anyone in the nation how to mobilize and organize groups, families, communities, and individuals." Two contributions that social workers are especially qualified to make are those of acting as facilitators for citizen groups and helping decision-makers approach problems in an holistic, integrative manner.

Social work has largely been opposed to revenue-sharing, despite federal claims that it brings government closer to the people and would enhance opportunities for citizen influence. Schneiderman suggested when revenue-sharing was introduced that it would promote racist policies. Magill and Clark noted its effect on local political processes, and emphasized the need for social workers to understand concepts of community power and decision-making. Magill noted that many social
workers feared revenue-sharing because the poor and powerless have never been significant forces when decisions are made at the local level. Hardcastle said,

> When given the choice, social work has generally preferred federal programs and federal protection while giving nominal recognition to community control of decision-making. Revenue-sharing provides no federal protection, no mandate to social workers or the poor to engage in the decision-making process . . . The ability to generate sound programming and block unsound approaches would depend on social work's ability to generate local rather than federal power.

It might be, however, Hardcastle added, that revenue-sharing would offer the opportunity to get local governments to build social programs into their budgets and make the governments more concerned with needs of the poor.

The 1975 Delegate Assembly of the National Association of Social Workers approved a policy statement entitled "General Revenue-Sharing." The statement contained concerns such as those cited above, and it emphasized the importance of social work attention at the local level to assure the allocation of funds that would best meet the needs of the population needing help.

With the rise of the block grant approach, a revision of the 1975 statement has been drafted to be considered at the next delegate assembly. It modifies the original statement "by addressing . . . what NASW should do to assure that such an approach is implemented in ways that do not harm the recipients of such funds." Among other concerns, it mentions "limitations and inequities of general revenue-sharing and monitor the program in regard to citizen participation, accountability, public information, enforcement of civil rights statutes, and the
earmarking of at least 25 per cent of funds for priorities in the areas of social services and health.

The statement on citizen participation says that local and state governments should be required to hold special hearings on general revenue-sharing and block grants, make decisions in meetings open to the public, and establish citizens' budgetary hearings. The federal government should, the proposed statement says, "establish a mechanism for appeals by the citizens' advisory committees." 111

In summary, social work is philosophically committed to democracy, to people's right of self-determination, and to participation of people in public affairs. This commitment is relevant to the social work profession in terms of its concern for social policy, as well as its inclusion of community work as a practice process. While social work espouses a responsibility for advocacy, implying support for social action strategies of participation, it traditionally has been allied more closely with community organization which stresses coordination and involvement of community leadership. Community development, which by some perceptions is the approach embodied in the CDBG legislation, is more intermediate strategy with which social work is also identified. If social work is to become more unified, the best chance is probably through middle-range strategies focused generally on the point at which personal and environmental needs intersect, rather than at the extreme of either orientation. Although social work has in this century been heavily identified with casework and clinical practice, it became more closely associated with environmental concerns and physical planning during the period of federal antipoverty initiatives. Social work is generally supportive of citizen participation as defined herein,
although many social workers subscribe to values, such as comprehensiveness in planning and policy-making, that research indicates are diminished by citizen participation. Although some social workers believed that revenue-sharing would increase citizen participation, social work has, in general, opposed revenue-sharing.

**Conclusion**

This chapter describes the rapid increase in the number of federal programs, and the requirement of most that there be citizen participation in their administration. Review of the literature suggests that what has been labelled citizen participation is in fact two entirely different phenomena. This study examines this and the effect of revenue-sharing on citizen participation through the investigation of a citizen participation program initiated in the context of the Community Development Block Grant Program.

Although the antipoverty programs are generally considered to have failed, the concept of citizen participation has persisted, although diminished, and appears to have become an institutionalized component of the nation’s political system. Its primary, avowed function is to influence social policy, and the antipoverty era policy goal was redistribution of income and resources. However, policy is the articulation of the public interest, and the effect of citizen participation depends upon the prevailing concept of the public interest. Social work has a strong commitment to democracy, and it supports citizen participation, both as policy and as an element in an area of practice. Social work endorses citizen participation as a means of achieving social change, as well as an expression of traditional democratic
values. In theory, it has a social change bias, but in practice it promotes strategies that are generally more identifiable with maintaining the conventional character of democratic policy-making. Revenue-sharing is viewed with apprehension by social work, but effective citizen participation is supported by the profession as an important element of it.
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CHAPTER II

THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION EXPERIENCE

Definitions and Conceptualization

Chapter I stated that citizen participation is defined for purposes of this study as participation which satisfies a federal requirement, and a definition consistent with this from literature was quoted. As perspective, additional definitions are cited here:

... .citizen participation is the involvement and responsible action of people around mutual concerns. ¹

... .the strategy of citizen participation is aimed at redistribution of decision-making authority and control between agencies and the client population. The rationale for citizen participation as applied to delivery systems is that clients will be guaranteed access and accountability if people like themselves are in positions to influence service delivery decisions. ²

Definitions of citizen participation vary. Most authors view it as a means of helping representative government work and of making governmental bureaucracy more responsive to citizens' preferences. Some definitions encompass virtually all interactions between citizens and governmental or private agencies. Typically, citizen participation means a structured interaction between a local citizens' group and a branch of government operating a specific program. ³

... .the process whereby citizens (e.g., people with only the power of their numbers) are able to actively exercise influence over significant decisions at different levels regarding societal goals and the allocation of resources and therefore the community's quality of life. ⁴

... .structured input to a process, or systems by those persons, and/or groups of individuals who are ultimately affected by the outcome, regardless of their current status with respect to political system accessibility. ⁵
the open, popular, knowledgeable and widespread direct and continuous involvement of the people of an affected community in the public policy decisions that affect their lives.\textsuperscript{6}

an act or a series of acts by which the "citizen has the opportunity to influence the distribution of benefits or losses which may be visited upon him (or upon those he represents) as a result of Federally supported activity.\textsuperscript{7}

any activity or action which enables individuals (old and young, rich and poor) to have "input" into the decision-making process and to play a role in improving the quality of life.\textsuperscript{8}

The ability to express to the city administration needed programs which would have some impact in solving community-problems.\textsuperscript{9}

The common thread is that citizen participation is a process that is intended to exert some level of influence on decisions pertaining to mutually shared concerns, needs, problems, and desires. Usually the process is directed at decisions of governmental officials or bodies, and it is generally associated with local decision-making, rather than at federal or state levels. There is wide variation with regard to specific contexts (for example, urban planning, education, environmental interests, or general government) and strategies employed.

Citizen participation has not matured to the point of a common language or conceptual base. Considerable attention has been given to classifying it from different standpoints, but no pattern has become generally accepted. It is not the purpose here to survey the efforts that have occurred or to suggest a system of categorization, even for purposes of facilitating this discussion. However, some of the approaches will be stated as a context for references that follow.

Some writers have examined citizen participation in terms of broad theoretical constructs. Bachrach offers two concepts: participation as "interaction," and participation as "instrumental actions".\textsuperscript{10} Warren,
et al., identify two thrusts, which are "citizen involvement" and "citizen action." Argyis identifies two ideal organizational types, one of which operates on participatory principles, and the other of which is authoritarian.

Other writers have categorized the general purposes of citizen participation. For example, Mogulof identified four purposes: (1) to decrease alienation, (2) to engage "sick" individuals in a "healing" process, (3) to create neighborhood power, and (4) to develop constituencies. From a survey of literature about participation in service delivery, Yin found five goals: (1) to increase the flow of information between servers and those served, (2) to improve attitudes of services officials, (3) to improve client attitudes, (4) to improve the services delivered, and (5) to increase client control. Yin, et al., conclude that there are two broad purposes: (1) to influence policy decisions and the allocation of resources, and (2) to share in the design, implementation, and monitoring of specific programs. Washnis identifies as purposes learned through the Model Cities program (1) training which enables the poor American to become involved in local government, (2) improvement of communication and trust between city hall and residents, (3) development of new leadership from a class of people who otherwise wouldn't have such an opportunity, (4) agreement on the kinds of projects citizens want, (5) provision of a process by which citizens can effectively criticize and evaluate services, and (6) formalization of citizen participation as a genuine part of government. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) reports that objectives are (1) to give information to citizens, (2) to get information from and about citizens, (3) to improve public decisions, programs, projects
and services, (4) to enhance acceptance of public decisions, programs, projects, and services, (5) to supplement public agency work, (6) to alter political power patterns and resource allocations, (7) to protect individual and minority groups rights and interests, and (8) to delay or avoid making difficult public decisions.17

A number of theoretical types or strategies of participation programs have been identified. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) publicized four: (1) the cooptation strategy, (2) the consultation strategy, (3) the education/social therapy strategy, and (4) the community power strategy. HUD officially recognized the last three as legitimate strategies in HUD programs.18 Burke listed as strategies (1) education-therapy, (2) behavioral change, (3) staff supplement, (4) cooptation, and (5) community power.19

Classification by intensity has become a common approach. The best known is Arnstein's "ladder" which ranks citizen participation example on eight steps from nonparticipation (manipulation and therapy) to tokenism (informing, consultation, and placation) to citizen power (partnership, delegated power, and citizen control).20 Gilbert and Specht identify three levels: (1) nonredistributive participation, (2) nominal participation and (3) redistributive participation.21 Frej and Specht describe (1) low-intensity "incrementalist" participation and (2) more intense forms, including (a) "bureaucratized" participation, (b) coalitions of staff and community representatives, and (c) normative developmental process.22 Mogulof cites four intensities, consisting of (1) employment and information, (2) dialogue and advice-giving, (3) shared authority, and (4) control.23 He also mentions three levels of structure: (1) advisory, (2) coalition and (3) adversary.24
Burke, et al., specify (1) cooptation, (2) accommodation and (3) self-determination. Holden lists categories which infer variations of intensity. They are (1) coordinated voluntarism, (2) therapeutic employment, (3) board membership, (4) surrogate advocate planners, (5) subsidized free enterprise, and (6) revenue sharecropping.

In a little different approach, Hooyman sees direction of motivation and influence as the key issue of participation as exemplified in community development. She says the dilemma is between "top-down planning aimed toward specific goals and immediate needs versus grass roots bottom-up organizational effort intended to enable citizens to develop their own problem solving abilities over time."

Other writers have perceived models of participation. Anderson et al., describe three models, each emphasizing (1) advocacy, (2) program services and development, or (3) cooperation. From a study of community action agencies, Capps identifies the Establishment Model, the Coalition Model, and the Grass Roots Model. Using various research findings, Cole developed some models which illustrated the relationship between certain variables.

A number of efforts have focused on what has been variously called the techniques or forms of citizen participation. Some of very general listings, such as one which includes (1) city-wide structures, (2) neighborhood advisory committees, (3) subcommittees and task forces, (4) public hearings and surveys, and (5) surveys. At the other extreme is a matrix in which Rosener identifies the functions performed by 39 different techniques. Among the techniques are, for example, citizens advisory committees, citizen review boards, citizen surveys, citizen training, hotlines, interactive cable television, neighborhood planning councils,
ombudsmen, priority-setting committees, public hearings, and public information programs, conferences, task forces, and workshops. Other listings containing similar techniques have been developed by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Hallman, Yin, and Gans. Stewart adds some items not commonly mentioned elsewhere, including "little city halls," letters to the editor, and neighborhood visits and Yates mentions self-help organizations and community corporations.

Additional efforts at conceptualization are discussed in Chapter V in connection with descriptive factors used in this study. It is apparent that there are differences between the purported and the actual functions fulfilled by citizen participation. While almost all programs are ostensibly for the purpose of providing at least some influence on public decisions, many tend to serve more such functions as legitimizing programs, providing social therapy and mobilizing community support. Such functions are useful and legitimate, but alone they are not responsive to the purposes of citizen participation as reflected in virtually all definitions that have been offered. In this study, citizen participation will be viewed from the perspective of its role in impacting decision-making.

Historical Background

The proliferation of citizen participation programs has already been mentioned. A number of efforts have been focused on cataloguing the federal programs. In 1978, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identified 143 federal programs with citizen participation requirements. Of these, 24 were said to have some decision-making power and the remainder are advisory only. At about the same
time, the Community Services Administration, in cooperation with the Federal Régional Council system, published information on 173 programs with participation requirements. Those which played the most significant roles in the last three decades will be discussed later in this chapter.

The early history of citizen participation is largely associated with private organizations. It was already visible and respected by the time the federal government became a major factor in social and economic life in the 1930's. Citizen participation was for a long time mainly an ad hoc activity, in which citizens banded together to achieve some specific goal and then dissolved the organization. As governmental processes matured, however, it became increasing institutionalized, and participation organizations persisted. Union organizing became a major participation thrust around the beginning of the twentieth century. Typical of national groups that developed are the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the League of Women Voters, and the National Organization of Women. Participation under government auspices is traced back to the Smith Lever Act of 1914, which established the Cooperative Extension Service. Federally sponsored participation first came into the limelight in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority. That experience has been described as cooptation of leaders to serve these purposes of the federal agency, and it has been credited with establishing two schools about the purpose of participation requirements: "administrative," which views it as a "reliable tool for the achievement of administrative goals," and "substantive," which provided citizens "an actual role in the determination of policy."

An important development in the formalization of participation in
federal policy was the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946, which embodies "a conscious policy of encouraging the participation of those regulated in the process of making the regulations." The first major requirement emerged in the seven point Workable Program of the urban renewal legislation of 1954. In the initial development of urban renewal legislation in 1949, there were provisions only for authority boards of "leading citizens," the purpose of which was to allow for borrowing capacity outside of state legislative requirements. For a number of years, implementation of the participation requirements of the 1954 legislation continued to consist of advisory boards of "citizen leaders, but neighborhood groups emerged about 1965 as the program sought their cooperation to carry out rehabilitation objectives. Despite the pragmatic nature of this participation, "the urban renewal program was the first governmental program to broaden the scope of participation beyond the communities' elites." 

The "citizen participation" terminology was introduced in the urban renewal legislation, but it became commonly used in connection with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The "maximum feasible participation" clause emerged largely out of the Ford Foundation's "Gray Areas" programs and the demonstration projects funded under the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. One of the demonstration projects, the HARYOU (Harlem Youth Opportunities, Unlimited, Inc.) program directly addressed the issue of political power and social change. Its approach to ameliorating poverty was "to plan and implement effective social action programs designed to obtain desired social change."

Following the leads provided by programs such as HARYOU and Mobilization for Youth, many of the
architects and supporters of the War on Poverty recognized that more than a paternalistic effort by the social work community was needed to remedy the structural arrangements that segregated the poor from the mainstream of society. Plus, the anti-poverty program was conceived in part to stimulate the organization of the poor for the purpose of promoting social change; it was a program planned by professionals to initiate a social movement. 50

The element of the Economic Opportunity Act that included the major participation thrust was the Community Action Program (CAP), which developed as independent, voluntary local agencies. In 1967, amendments to the Act provided that gave local governments the option of bringing the CAP under official control of those governments. However, a sufficiently strong constituency had been created that few programs were taken over. 51

In 1966, the Model Cities Program emerged with a requirement for citizen participation, and numerous other programs followed. The Model Cities Program, enacted as Title II of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, marked the beginning of a rapprochement between grass roots groups and established political leadership, stating unequivocably that local implementation must be controlled by the local governing body of the city or county. Although conceived in the spirit of the CAP, it resulted in a shift of authority and resources to the chief executive of the government. 52

There will be more extensive discussion of the main programs, beginning with Urban Renewal, later in this chapter. Stenberg identifies three distinct periods in the development of citizen participation prior to 1974:

1949-63 The nonindigenous citizen as advisor-pur-suader ("blue-ribbon" committees)
1964-68 The indigenous citizen as partner-adversary (the Economic Opportunities and Model Cities programs)

1968-74 Regionalism and decentralization (neighborhood services)

In 1974, the CDBG legislation was enacted, and citizen participation in that context is the subject of this study. The different federal programs and changing philosophical directions meant a series of different approaches in most local communities. An analysis of the evolution of participation efforts in St. Paul, Minnesota, for instance, states that the CDBG participation mechanism was the sixth major approach employed.54

Citizen Participation in the Landmark Programs

This section presents a more full discussion of the landmark citizen participation programs (Urban Renewal, Community Action and Model Cities) and the impact of each. Following this discussion, consideration will be given to other major citizen participation settings prior to the CDBG program. These other settings include planning, community services, and special projects.

The first of the landmark initiatives was urban renewal. As stated earlier, citizen participation was introduced in the Urban Renewal Program as a requirement for involvement of community elites. This made sense during the early stages in which the emphasis was on redevelopment, and the need was for people who would exercise authority and generate resources to acquire and dispose of property. When doubt arose about the effectiveness of redevelopment and the program emphasis was broadened from slum clearance to rehabilitation, the cooperation of citizens became important, and gradually after 1954, some neighborhood level participation developed.55 In that year, citizen participation was legislatively set forth as one of seven "workable programs"
requirements.

Urban Renewal has not been judged by those who have studied it as very influential in decision-making. Gilbert describes it as primarily educational. VanTil and VanTil observe that the big decisions were made at supra-neighborhood levels, and the non-elite participation in renewal conflict was often passive in nature. A dissertation study concluded that

... although citizen participation is legally mandated, only the opportunity for input is in the legislation; the acceptance of views is not. The researcher suggests that patterns of decision-making will not be influenced by the existence of committees alone, but rather through the acceptance of citizen participation into the decision-making process as valid and valued contribution.

In 1974, Urban Renewal was legislatively terminated, and its functions became a part of the CDBG program. Local agencies continued in many communities, but they were funded through CDBG.

The precise origin of the War on Poverty, the second landmark thrust and consisting principally of the Economic Opportunity Act Programs, is obscure. Friedman says it was probably started by an elite group inside the federal government during the presidency of John F. Kennedy. Piven and Cloward suggest it was conceived by the Democratic Party to quell discontent. It was originally intended to be coordinative, but this was found to be unfeasible, and the CAP moved toward increasing the political participation of previously excluded citizens, patterned after the HARYOU and other programs, as described earlier.

The Greene Amendment was enacted in 1967, placing ultimate control with local governments. The local CAP boards were legislated to consist of one-third democratically-selected representatives of the poor,
one-third local elected officials or their representatives, and one-third representatives of private groups. In 1970, Moynihan argued that the "maximum feasible participation" provision was misunderstood, and two years later the Federal Advisory Committee Act of 1972 was passed, which established the principle that "government citizen involvement programs are complementary and subservient to the power invested in elected and appointed officials." The general view that the War on Poverty, of which the CAP was the key program, was not very successful has already been noted in Chapter I. There were exceptions, such as that expressed by Levine:

The institutions were created using federal money, the confrontations of the partial interests of the poor and the partial interests of the other parts of the community took place, and institutions were changed, in many cases in ways favorable to the poor.

However, as community action strategies were generally thwarted, local CAP agencies moved toward services delivery. This transition has been described by, among others, Kramer, Wolman, and Booher. Sundquist and Davis found that the poor came to realize they had political power and began to exercise it effectively, but they moved away from an action orientation as regulations, cooptations, and other barriers discouraged them. A typical assessment is that, as one study concluded, in most local programs citizen participation "was more wishful thinking than tangible reality." Still, there has been continuing support for the view that the experience "in no way invalidates the idea of community participation."

In 1973, in response to the Nixon Administration efforts to abolish the Community Action Program, the Office of Economic Opportunity, which administrated the CAP, was replaced with the Community Services
Administration (CSA), signifying a move toward emphasis on services delivery rather than community action. However, when Richard Rios took over as Director of the CSA in 1980, he reaffirmed the commitment of the program to advocacy and institutional change. The person he replaced said regarding citizen participation in 1978,

Citizen participation does support and complement the constitutional role of elected officials. Citizen participation, however, has made a demonstrable difference in the lives of the poor and disadvantaged in America, and this is recent.\textsuperscript{72}

In 1981, the CSA was eliminated, and antipoverty funding was then distributed to states through the Community Services Block Grant. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, through which the change was made, preserved the requirement for community action boards, but it reserved for the states the role of determining the purpose and powers of the board.

Following upon Urban Renewal and the Community Action Program, the third landmark program of mandated citizen participation, was that of Model Cities. President Lyndon Johnson said of the program's purpose; Not just to build housing units, but neighborhoods; not just to construct schools, but to educate children; not just to raise income, but to create beauty and end the poisoning of our environment.\textsuperscript{73}

The early objectives were innovation and institutional change.\textsuperscript{74} The intent was to demonstrate the impact that could be made on the alleviation of social problems in deteriorated urban areas through the concentrated and coordinated use of various funding resources.\textsuperscript{75} This was to be accomplished through the mobilization of local leadership and initiative.\textsuperscript{76} The program was administered by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and local projects were awarded to communities on the basis of competitive applications.
The judgment about the Model Cities success or failure is widely divided. Generally, the views have been that the program achieved little in the way of substantive, quality-of-life change, but that there were other accomplishments. During the congressional hearings on the CDBG legislation, there was testimony to the effect that it resulted in poor persons entering city politics.\(^77\) Washnis declared that Model Cities was the single greatest influence to that time in changing local government operations to serve disadvantaged areas.\(^78\) Similar positive assessments were reported by Sundquist and Davis,\(^79\) and by Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn.\(^80\) A typical negative view is that of Strange, to the effect that, although pluralistic input expanded, there was "no radical change in distribution of influence, power, services, rewards, or other benefits."\(^81\)

Gilbert and Specht said in 1977 that the general verdict was that Model Cities had failed.\(^82\) However, they added, even though the program had not significantly reduced poverty or reformed the federal system of categorical grants, it had provided an opportunity to experiment with and learn more about the dynamics of planning.\(^83\)

With specific reference to citizen participation, the Model Cities legislation mandated "widespread citizen participation," in contrast to the "maximum feasible participation" change of the Economic Opportunities Act.\(^84\) The Model Cities program philosophically favored substantive participation, and citizen participation plans were a major consideration in the selection of participating communities.\(^85\) Although it was clear the program was to be controlled by city hall, HUD described it as a partnership between the city and the community.\(^86\) It said the citizen participation structure should not be merely advisory, but should be a catalyst in developing new structures and processes.\(^87\) According to HUD in 1967, there
As the program progressed, the partnership citizen role did not remain contained. Encouraged by the Nixon administration, local governments increased their control, and in many instances the participation developed into what Arnstein described as "maximum feasible manipulation." The Model Cities approach to citizen participation, it has been reported, "was terminated by Congress when it appeared that an enormous expenditure of time and money produced little representative input from disadvantaged citizens."

Because the Model Cities program placed an emphasis on comprehensive rational planning, professional planners became heavily involved. Advocacy planning, discussed later in this chapter, became a part of many local efforts. The involvement of community citizens with planners dispelled distrust of planners and developed social planning integrally related to physical planning.

In 1971, President Nixon announced the Planned Variations program, which he said was designed to demonstrate... the validity of the principle that when local governments are given the opportunity and the resources, they can and will manage their affairs effectively and in a way that is responsive to all of their citizens.

The program gave 20 cities an opportunity to develop a citywide strategy of urban development, by providing local governments greater latitude than conventional Model Cities in determining the geographical coverage
program structure, by reducing federal requirements, by providing for comprehensive, citywide planning, and by increasing the role of local executives. The citizen participation structures under Planned Variation tended to be more advisory and more "blue ribbon" in nature than in the regular Model Cities programs. Studies revealed that the approach tended to shift resources from poor areas to cities as a whole.94

For purposes here, the significance is that Planned Variations was an early step toward the New Federalism. Although Model Cities has generally been described as a categorical grant-in-aid program, it was, in comparison to the Economic Opportunities programs and other federally funded services, a big move toward provision of funds and authority to local general governments. Planned Variations carried this further. It was a deliberate experiment to test the basic strategy of revenue-sharing. Like the Urban Renewal Program, Model Cities was replaced by the CDBG program in 1974.

**Citizen Participation in Planning**

During the War on Poverty period, and probably somewhat as a consequence of it, citizen participation became an important element in the field of planning. In many instances the traditional settings of planning, the physically oriented urban and regional planning and the social planning which had heretofore been largely the province of the voluntary sector, were blurred into the planning and the decision-making of the new federal programs. Often the traditional planning structures were utilized in the planning aspects of the new programs, and in other instances professional planning personnel moved from the traditional settings into the new operations.
Because much of the urban planning activity was involved in the implementation of federal programs with mandated participation requirements, this planning came to include citizen participation components. Social planning, which had been characterized by community participation of an elitist nature, broadened to involve a wider spectrum of the community. In addition to federal requirements, a factor was the general social commitment of the times which became reflected in social institutions, including the professions. Within both urban planning and social work (the traditional profession of social planning), strong bases of support developed for participation opportunities for consumers, clients, and indigenous, low-income constituents. Subgroups of specialists, such as advocacy planners and community workers, developed. New fields of planning that emerged during the period, such as health planning, incorporated participations requirements.

The result tended to be fusing of planning and policy-making. The distinction between "policy planners" and "planner-technocrats," as Gilbert and Specht designated them, became blurred. Traditional planning ideology was criticized for giving too little consideration to social impacts and the interests of important segments of the population.

In this dissertation, a distinction is not made between citizen participation in planning, on the one hand, and participation in administration and policy-making on the other. Although some federally mandated participation has administrative responsibilities, the emphasis of most of it is on planning functions. In urban planning, these functions center around decisions about such things as land use, and in the different variations of social planning they center on the mobilization and allocation of human services resources. In some programs, the federal mandate has contributed to planning that has integrated the physical and
social content of planning. Since the main function of most federally mandated participation is planning, there is a common core of concepts and principles that is applicable to all such participation programs.

The literature of citizen participation in planning has been extensive, especially during the 1970's. For purposes here, the subject will be discussed in terms of (1) urban physical planning, (2) social planning, and (3) health planning.

Among definitions of urban planning are the following:

\[\ldots\text{a course of action which can be carried into effect, which can be expected to lead to the attainment of the ends sought, and which someone intends to carry into effect.}\]  

The ability to identify community problems, postulate alternatives, and agree on programs to abate such problems.  

Gans identifies two traditional assumptions of urban planning. One is that a change in the physical environment will bring about social changes, and the second is that planning in inherently method-oriented, rather than goal-oriented. A third basic assumption is that planning must emphasize efficiency, comprehensiveness, and rational considerations. Gilbert and Specht described planning as it existed prior to the changes that began with the urban renewal "workable program" requirements:

Until then, city planning had been more concerned about short-run, locational urban problems that involved land use and industrial interests and with long-range formulation of a comprehensive master plan. The "social" goals of planning were frequently dictated by economic and political interests, and the function of the social welfare planner was perceived to be that of making goals more palatable to an ever more resistant community.
This changed during about the next two decades. Planning was said to have been inadequate in terms of the redistributational standards of the new federal programs. The American Institute of Planners adopted a code on serving the economically disadvantaged:

A planner shall seek to expand choice and opportunity for all persons, recognizing a special responsibility to plan for the needs of disadvantaged groups and persons, and shall urge the alteration of policies, institutions and decisions which mitigate against such objectives.

Typical of the views that became common is the following:

But sociological theory and planning practice must address themselves to those aspects of the environment that really matter, and if the planner wants to affect people's lives through his effort, he must understand the process by which the environment exerts an impact on their behavior and themselves.

Concurrent with the shifting views came the introduction of citizen participation. Fagence says that the social ethics of planning has participation as one of its foundations. He suggests that participation be conceived, not as an alternative to the conventional decision-making process pursued by public planning agencies, but as a decision-making partnership.

The changes in planning were controversial. There were arguments that planners could often predict long-range impacts that citizens could not recognize or accept, and there was resistance by planners to the tendency of citizen participation to replace comprehensiveness with incrementalism and the method orientation with new goal and processual orientations. According to Lauffer, planners involved participation only for short-term, pragmatic uses, rather than for larger impacts. A study for HUD reported that "case studies generally indicated that when citizen participation was sustained and meaningful it increased
the effectiveness of planning. To date, however, few communities have been able to generate sufficient citizen participation to accomplish this.\textsuperscript{109}

From the standpoint of citizen participation, an important development was the advocacy planning concept. The concept holds that the community is pluralistic and planning is political. Gans says that planning should see people of the city, not as isolated individuals, but as interest and client groups of which the community is an aggregate, and that "planning is inevitably a method of advocacy which is firmly imbedded in the political process."\textsuperscript{110} From this perspective, Davidoff advanced the thesis that planners ought to advocate for particular social and political interests. Led by racial unrest and other conditions of the time, his view was that questions concerning the justice of the existing distribution of social and political resources could not be answered through technical methods. He said that planners are not value neutrals, that "the right course of action is always a matter of choice, never of fact," and that planners should represent particular clients and maximize the impact of these clients values on public policy.\textsuperscript{111}

In the social climate of the 1960's and early 1970's, advocacy planning generated substantial interest and support in the urban planning profession. However, there were many who questioned it. Goodman believed that advocacy planning would not change the basic distribution of wealth and power, and that it would therefore only be complicit in allowing the "poor to administer their own state of dependency."\textsuperscript{112}

These were those who continued to maintain that communities are unitary, rather than pluralist. So, et.al., believed advocacy planning would be impractical in a government agency in which the planner would be
caught between the interests of special groups and city government officials. Gilbert and Specht predicted that, with local government executives gaining extended spheres of influence during the 1970's, the advocacy planner could become a planner-technocrat, remote from the would-be beneficiaries. While the mention of advocacy planning has diminished, there are still occasional discussions of current examples. Traditionally the community organization aspect of the voluntary community services systems, social planning became strongly identified with the emerging governmental social programs of the antipoverty era, under the various public and private auspices through which they were administered. Many of the programs encouraged or required a planning component. Gans describes the traditional planning as "interagency of social work programs," and Kravitz describes it as a process carried out by business and social elites. As social planning became viewed more broadly to include the new programs, Gilbert and Specht defined it as "the conscious attempt to solve problems and control the course of future events by foresight, systematic thinking, investigation and the exercise of value preferences in choosing among alternative courses of action. In 1977, they treated social work and community organization together as "a fusion of concepts." Almost inherently, citizen participation is an element of social planning. Substantial research and literature has been devoted to the subject, including differing of appraisals of its effectiveness. Perlman questions whether social planning can really be done, but the activity by which it is described continues to play an important role in human services systems.

A third area of planning involving citizen participation is health planning. The federal Partnership in Health legislation of 1967 provided that a majority of the members of areawide health planning boards be
consumers, and this was carried over into the subsequent Health Systems legislation. Considerable research has been done concerning citizen participation in health planning, particularly by Parkum, who has concluded that

... actual participation in CHP committees reflects the pluralist view, abhorred by many advocates of participatory democracy of a relatively limited number of consistently active members continually participating and demanding resources of the system. 122

The topic has been the subject of doctoral research by Miniz, who concluded in 1982 that participation in health planning has been "contrived and meaningless," 123 Grant, who described in 1982 how the participation has become institutionalized, 124 and Jeffe, who conducted a study in which the data suggested that the health care industry dominated the policy process through an uneasy alliance among diverse provider groups and with sympathetic consumer groups. 125

Citizen Participation in Community Services and General Settings

Quite a bit of literature has appeared concerning descriptions of and research about citizen participation in other settings, most of which involve federal funding for which participation is mandated. Examples are writings about participation in mental health programs by Borland, 126 Cravens, 127 and Dorwart and Meyers; 128 in Title XX planning, by Miller; 129 in education, by Salisbury; 130 in planning to meet needs of the elderly, by Schram; 131 in community development corporations, by Mico; 132 in transportation planning, by Omiboken and Curry; 133 and highways and waste water management, by Pruginin. 134

Some participation programs have been locally instigated efforts to foster participation in general community decision-making. Examples
are community goal-selling, such as the "Goals for Dallas" program, and Gateways, a project in Greensboro, North Carolina. 

Aside from the requirements in individual programs, there have been several initiatives of the federal government to promote participation in general. One was the Citizen Involvement Network, and another was the development in 1979 of citizen participation plans by various federal agencies and departments in response to renewed emphasis on citizen participation by the Carter administration.

**Research and Assessment**

Citizen participation programs have provided a laboratory for a substantial amount of research. Some has been cited earlier in this dissertation, and some are cited in later chapters. However, it is not the purpose here to list or digest all that has been learned from the study of programs. The discussion here will focus on some major thrusts of the research and assessment that are especially relevant in this context. They include (1) the impacts of citizen participation, (2) the desirability of middle-range approaches, and (3) selected other subjects.

The impacts of citizen participation has already been mentioned. However, at the risk of some repetition, a somewhat more specific discussion is presented here.

Several efforts have been made to summarize the impact that studies have shown resulted from participation programs. The ACIR report on participation concludes from a survey of various studies that citizen participation has frequently been effective in influencing decisions about the allocation of federal funds, stimulating local participation
on grant programs, supporting the transfer of funds from the general fund to grant programs, and exerting pressure on local government to retain a program after federal funds ceased. However, the influence has been conditional upon a number of factors, the chief of which are adequate staff support, the power to investigate grievances, and the election of citizen members of participation structures. Citizen participation has had little impact, the report says, on program performance and citizens' feelings of alienation from government. 138

Yin has concluded that (1) attitudinal changes were not accomplished, (2) there was an impact on service delivery, and (3) there were few dramatic impacts on the quality of life or changes in power structure. 139 Wireman cites the following as notable gains:

1. Bureaucrats are becoming more aware of needs for input from citizens and consumers.
2. The right of citizens and consumers to participate has been established.
3. Minor improvements have been made in delivery of services.
4. Groups formerly excluded are learning how to use or bypass traditional political and administrative channels.
5. A generation of leaders from groups formerly denied opportunities for advancement are now in leadership positions in government.

Gilbert concluded in 1970 that participation programs had not succeeded in democratizing social welfare, 141 and Perlman said that organizations of the poor, clients, and black citizens had strengthened people's ability to press claims, "but did not give them a foothold in the politics of representative democracy." 142 A number of investigators note that there were few instances in which effective bases of social action were established. Among these investigators are Kahn, Warren, et al., 144 and Xohan. 145 The fact that most low-income are not
interested in participation has been noted by Warren, Gans, and others.

Probably the most common observation is that, while there are many evidences of effective influence, few involve influence toward change of a substantial nature. According to observers such as Gittell, Wireman, and Yin, seldom have there been impacts on the quality of life or the power structure of urban society. Nathan found no clear relationship between the amount of citizen participation and level of influence.

The negative aspects of citizen participation have been discussed by many. Fagence and Aleshire have cited financial costs, the time required to carry out projects, and general inefficiency. Stewart cites such things as influence by uninformed citizens, the generation of conflict, participant parochialism, and the lack of representativeness. Rein observes that participation impedes innovation.

Some explanations have been offered regarding the failure of many participation programs to live up to expectations. Among them are that (1) the programs were not fired by real reform, launched out of mass discontent, (2) the victims of poverty have a low level of expectations, and little hope for change, (3) participation contradicts popular reforms favored by urban scholars for several decades, (4) participation structures have not been viable, and (5) the scope of participation was too limited, and needed to reach "intimately into all parts of the economy and policy." Despite all the evidence to the effect that participation has not produced dramatic impacts and is characterized by some impediments and disadvantages, the general verdict in the literature is, on balance,
supportive of citizen participation. Numerous accomplishments and advantages are mentioned. Among them are information and communication values observed by Cole,\textsuperscript{161} Yin,\textsuperscript{162} Dobbs,\textsuperscript{163} and Camp.\textsuperscript{164} Booher says, additionally, that participation is important in maintaining consent of the governed, facilitating the mutual adjustment of groups in planning, redistributing authority, and providing a countervailing force to protect social programs from encroachment of institutional interests.\textsuperscript{165} Gilbert says participation creates a climate of opinion that indirectly shapes public decisions.\textsuperscript{166} Kahn notes the socialization advantage to participants.\textsuperscript{167} 

A number of writers, among them Warren, et al.,\textsuperscript{168} and Kweit and Kweit,\textsuperscript{169} identify accomplishments in the accessibility and improvement of services. According to Lipsky, the involvement of the poor in helping define problems may support efforts to define new relations between clients and professionals.\textsuperscript{170} 

Although evidence was mentioned earlier to the effect that participation has little effect on citizen feelings of alienation from government, Dole found that participation increases confidence in local officials, achieves a perception of more balanced allocation of resources, and improves participants political competency.\textsuperscript{171} Hallman reports that his study reveals that neighborhood control "paid dividends. . . in neighborhood morale and self-pride."\textsuperscript{172} 

Until the middle 1970's, a commonly expressed view was that citizen participation is imperative. Typical of the reasons are those advanced by Cahn and Cahn: 

\begin{quote}
First, participation, in and of itself, constitutes affirmative activity--an exercise of the very initiative, the creativity, the self-reliance, the faith that specific programs. . . seek to instill.
\end{quote}
second, citizen participation, properly utilized, is a means of mobilizing the resources and energies of the poor—of converting the poor from passive consumers of the services of others into producers of those services...

Third, citizen participation constitutes a source of special insight, of information, of knowledge and experience which cannot be ignored by those concerned with whether their efforts are fulfilling their aims.

Other similar conclusions are those of Nelsen and Rein. While they are stated less frequently now, such views are still common, as stated earlier.

Probably the most common research finding has been the desirability of middle-range approaches. While the findings differ, of course, depending upon the specific issue and conditions, it has been found in regard to most dimensions studied that moderate stances have been more successful than those that are extreme. Cole identified the need for moderate goals that would satisfy both the participants and average citizens, and Mogulof called attention to "the gaping hole" between neighborhood policies that foster control and those that sustain the authority of federal and local governments. Yin suggests the employment of a combination of strong and weak strategies.

One frequent focus of attention has been the relationship between participants and governmental officials. In general, findings have supported a condition of parity, in which a strong and politically integrated group maintains a stance of cooperation or partnership with local government. Among those who had reported conclusions to this general effect are Cole, Gilbert and Specht, Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn, and Hooyman.

Gilbert and Specht cite the desirability of moderate degrees of autonomy for resident organizations. Cole found that the most
successful programs are those characterized by compromise between service functions on the one hand, and "trust in government" functions on the other.\textsuperscript{184} He found, also, that clients are generally satisfied with and believe they achieve the most success with a structure "which avoids either extreme of the participation matrix."\textsuperscript{185}

The literature contains concepts that suggest positions of mutual equity by the parties in citizen participation. Illustrative of such concepts are "analysis of judgement" policy\textsuperscript{186} and social exchange theory.\textsuperscript{187}

The discussion of research and assessment on other subjects will be limited here to several items of special interest in this context that have not been previously mentioned. Washnis concluded that, based on Model Cities experience, citizen participation is strongest when, among other things (1) the participant organization has the right to operate some programs, (2) there is a citywide orientation, with councils in all areas, and (3) there is support and involvement of official city leadership.\textsuperscript{188} Cason found that the higher the social class of the leaders in participation structures, the greater the success in policy intervention, and he attributed this to the greater level of organizational competence.\textsuperscript{189} Mogulof discovered an inverse relationship between the strength of national citizen participation policies and the strength of local citizen influence.\textsuperscript{190}

The interest in citizen participation has sparked the search for new ideas and approaches. One about which quite a bit has been written recently is "co-production," in which the beneficiaries or constituents of services participate in the provision of them.\textsuperscript{191} Another is "intervenor funding," in which government funds are provided to an organization to enable it to represent a particular view in decision-making on
Summary

With the growth of citizen participation, beginning in the 1950's, interest developed in the study of the various programs. To facilitate this, efforts were made to develop a conceptual framework. Among dimensions used in description were broad theoretical types, categories of intensity, direction of influence, models, and techniques and forms.

Beginning with the urban renewal legislation of 1954 and continuing through the Great Society and early New Federalism programs that followed, citizen participation requirements provided a rich laboratory for the investigation of participation as a question of public policy. The Community Action Program rapidly became a locally autonomous vehicle of social action, but as a matter of survival, it moved toward a service orientation and more cooperative strategies as time went by. Model Cities was designed for local government control and emphasis on coordination, and through the "planned variation" projects of its later stages, it became a transitional first step to federal revenue-sharing. Planning was a basis component of most programs, and the field of planning became integrally related to social policy-making and advocacy.

The investigation of citizen participation in many different contexts during this period revealed that it had little impact on social structures and values. However, in many situations it did produce influence on decisions about such things as the allocation of funds, and it usefully served other functions such as communication and socialization. Despite costs and impediments that were identified, the prevailing view was that it was imperative that it continue as an element of federal programs.
One major finding was that the most successful participation was that which was characterized by middle-range features. In general, the greatest impact resulted from moderation in goals, strategies, and degrees of control. The best results emerged from mid-point positions in relation to service versus action, and cooperation versus conflict in the relation to local government.
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CHAPTER III
TWO PARADIGMS

Background

The literature on citizen participation in governmental programs contains numerous references to confusion regarding the nature, purposes, and consequences. Although there have been efforts at comprehensive and conceptualization of the subject, as described in Chapter II, no pattern has gained common acceptance and use. This lack of clarity has been, according to Mogulof, a "deeply-rooted negative" in the development of citizen participation. ¹ Part of the problem, Mogulof says, is that the federal government is very unspecific. "The laws themselves are either silent or very slim with regard to purpose, and with one or two exceptions, so are legislature histories." He adds that as long as this is the case, there will be a great variety of local experience, and the concept will be difficult to study and implement.² However, he notes, in some instances local programs are strong, even though national policies are weak.³

So, et al., believes there is a need for more stability in citizen participation, and that it should be developed by local governments, rather than federal.⁴ Wireman cites the lack of uniformity and the need for more standards for evaluation and monitoring.⁵ Warren describes vast differences that exist between different examples of citizen participation.⁶
More federal guidance has been suggested as a solution. In 1970, Mogulof opposed a single federal interagency policy as an answer, because a particular structure might be antithetical to national goals in a given situation. However, he advocated the adoption of minimum federal performance standards which would include provisions regarding, among other things, representation, access, technical assistance, and monitoring.

The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations recommended in 1978 that Congress and the President "enact legislation establishing general citizen participation policies for advisory processes to be applied consistently throughout the federal aid system." More specifically, the Commission recommended that there be a single federal agency responsible for administration and monitoring, and that there be a certification process.

Review of the literature suggests that there are really two entirely different phenomena included in the broad concept of citizen participation. The writer of this thesis believes the evidence dictates that much of the confusion is attributable to ascribing certain standards to a given case that are really not applicable to that case. To be effective, the writer thinks, federal policies need to distinguish between two entirely separate ideas. The literature contains frequent references to distinctions between, for example, "citizen involvement" and "social action", but it treats them as different expressions of the same basic concept. Many typologies, such as Arnstein's "ladder of participation," identify a number of different forms or degrees of participation, suggesting that these are parts of a whole or points on a continuum.
In general, however, all of the examples can be sorted into two groups that have little in common except that they are both labelled citizen participation and they both represent some link between citizens and government in policymaking or program administration. Briefly, the two are (1) participation that is inspired by democratic ideology and is fundamentally an extension of the traditional governmental structure, and (2) participation that is inspired by human needs and problems, and is directed toward systems change. The two are treated hereafter as two paradigms of citizen participation—the Democratic Ideology Paradigm and the Social Reform Paradigm.

One purpose of the project reported here was to examine through study of the Citizen Participation Organization whether, in the context of revenue-sharing as exemplified by the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) the dual paradigm conceptualization is valid and useful, and what determines the selection of paradigm. The paradigms are described further in subsequent sections of this paper.

Most writers on citizen participation agree that some form of control by citizens is essential for effective democracy. But, by its nature, citizen participation is essentially neutral with regard to redistributive objectives. The chief issue is whether participation exists to serve majority rights or minority rights. The features of a specific example are determined by this.

The causal roots of citizen participation provide some clue to its dual nature. Rosenbaum cites middle-class supporters of good government as one source of influence toward expansion of participation, and blacks, the poor, youth, and "other disadvantaged groups" as another. Langton associates the rise of participation programs with three developments, two of which are the civil rights movement and the public
interest movement which emphasizes openness and access to government. Kweit and Kweit mention as causal factors the movement by blacks to achieve equality, and the growing general sense of distance from government. Stewart similarly cites the motivation of blacks and the poor, and citizen discontent with local government.

From these roots emerged two distinct developments, one responding to the injustices and suffering of minority groups in the population, and the other responding to the more generalized citizen dissatisfaction with the functioning of the democratic system. Although most writers have tended to see citizen participation as a single concept with many variables, a number have dichotomized the concept along the lines discussed here. Warren, et al., identify "two drastically different and contradictory conceptions of citizen participation," which they call citizen involvement and citizen action. Katzenelson cites two totally different policy objectives, which are the neighborhood perspective of favorable allocation of goods and services, and the government administration perspective of increased trust and confidence. Gans provides a good description of the difference between participation as political power and as consent to professionally developed programs within the regular government structure. Warren, et al., distinguish between "input" and "output" constituencies that represent participation from two perspectives. Kweit and Kweit discuss citizen participation in two models of public interest, collectivist and individualist. Riccard discusses two paradigms of citizen participation—Rousseauean, which emphasizes virtue and the common good, and Smithian, which stresses self interest and competition of wants and desires. Among others who have similarly made the distinctions are Cole, Holden, Rein, Gans, Carey, and Langton.
Others have in discussion of related concepts alluded to the
dichotomy. Hallman compares emphasis or efficiency and rationality in
the regular government system with the need for consideration of human
relations and feelings. A report of model cities planning in East St.
Louis cites the dilemma prompted by two ideologies, one emphasizing
rationality and the other stressing responsiveness to resident partici-
pation. Gilbert and Specht discuss "rational" and "natural-system"
models.

The discussion which follows is a description of the roots and
nature of the two paradigms.

The Democratic Ideology Paradigm

The roots of American democracy are the classical theories of the
eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the contemporary theories of
the twentieth century. Thomas Jefferson is widely accepted as the
source of America's classical democratic tradition. He espoused a num-
ber of tiers of government, with the preponderance of services performed
at the level closest to the people. Although he endorsed direct de-
mocracy as exemplified by town meetings, his thinking included a mix-
ture of direct and representative government techniques. He supported
techniques designed to assure participation, such as rotation in office,
equal suffrage and representation in the decision-making process of
higher local governments, and direct input at the local level.

Another source of ideas associated with classical democracy are
the thinkers of the European tradition. They have in common that they
conceived of citizens as ideal beings that were basically rational and
seekers of the common good. However, some, referred to as utilitarians,
considered participation as a means to an end, and they stressed the representational and governmental aspects. Among these were James Mill and Bentham. Others viewed participation more as an "end", an educational and developmental process. Among these were Rousseau and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau, for whom citizen participation was the center of his entire political theory, said of man, "By dint of being exercised, his faculties will develop, his ideas take on a wider scope, his sentiments become ennobled, and his whole soul be so elevated." For Mill, also, full participation was a fundamental theme, but, in contrast to Rousseau's extreme egalitarianism, he believed in having the "wisest and best" in positions of authority.

Beginning with Lippman in the early 1920s, contemporary theory was introduced. The revisionist school of thought represented by Lippman was the response to the advent of industrialization, urbanization, big government, big interest groups, and mass media. Its advocates based their ideas on what they considered to be realistic views of citizens, rather than what they perceived as the idealistic views of classical democracy. They assumed a largely "passive" or "practical" view of the average citizen's participatory role and capacity. The voices of revisionism, representing variations of specific interpretations, include Schumpeter, Dahl, and others. Lipset is concerned primarily with conditions that make for stability of the democratic system, and Eckstein concentrates on conditions that sustain a system.

Revisionist thinking served well during a period of high rational consensus that reached into the 1950's. Then a weakening of traditional institutions—the family, the church or synagogue, the community—brought a state of Durkheim's "anomie" and discontent. Bachrach and
others introduced a modern, sociologically inspired participative theory. It emphasizes primary, person-to-person groups. Out of it, Pateman summarizes, will come a system wherein "maximum input (participation) is required and whose output includes not just policies (decisions) but also the development of the social and political capabilities of each individual."\textsuperscript{46}

Concurrent with the conditions associated with the new participative theory was an increase of public concern about the rise of bureaucracy. One reaction has been to strengthen the local political branches of government, and a second has been a focus on the need for direct citizen participation in and control over administrative processes.\textsuperscript{47} This will be discussed further a little later.

The major issue in democratic theory is that of direct versus representative governance. Hutcheson and Steggart point out that the concept of democracy rests on citizen influence, whether direct or representative.\textsuperscript{48} Much of the discussion of participative government concerns the concept of representation. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations identifies representative democracy as a major issue in relation to citizen participation. The argument is made that interchange between representatives and citizens is needed beyond that afforded by the electoral process.\textsuperscript{49} Dobbs notes that the concept of participatory democracy is applicable to both direct and representative systems.\textsuperscript{50}

In a different respect, Fagence points out that the product of a citizen participation structure itself depends upon the representative makeup of the participants,\textsuperscript{51} and cites four possibilities attributed to Griffiths: descriptive, in which a person represents others by being
symbolic representation, in which a person assumes attitudes and expressions associated with identifiable interests; ascriptive representation, in which an elitest "advisor" or advocate acts on behalf of others; and representation of interests, in which a "general" representative prosecutes particular interests. 52

Thus, representation is a key concept in relation to citizen participation. In a direct democracy, citizens have direct influence over the governmental administrative structure, in addition to participating directly in the determination of policies. In a representative system, the influence is exercised largely through the electoral process. Beyond that, citizen influence is dependent on the accessibility and responsiveness of elected representatives. In democratic theory there is an intermediate option between direct and delegate representative systems, which is a system in which individual representatives are instructed through direct participation processes. In practice, such a structure is rare.

Citizen participation as defined herein is a provision for citizen influence beyond that accorded through the electoral process. It, itself, may be direct, as in the case of open public hearings or general citizen surveys, or representative, in which a group of citizens act on behalf of a larger body of the population. If it is the latter, the makeup of the participation structure is important in terms of the influence exerted.

A key question of citizen participation is one of majority rule versus minority rights. 53 Is the participation enhancement mechanism in a given instance for the purpose of extending the influence opportunities of the population at large, or is it to provide a counter
balance for a minority interest? The structure, including the makeup of representation, determines which goal is served.

In its most common usage, participatory democracy refers to the general concept of broad citizen involvement in governmental affairs. It includes increased participation through regular, formal provisions, such as electoral processes and referenda. One aspect of it is citizen participation, defined here to include channels of involvement that are supplementary to the usual and regular processes.

Participatory democracy is covered extensively in the literature. The following are examples of supportive statements:

- Participation is a value that extols the virtue of each and every man joining meaningfully and directly in making decisions that affect his welfare.  

- The belief that citizens should be involved directly in the organizations and social processes which affect them is the essence of the democratic tradition.

- Devolution of authority must take place where citizens become more involved in the decision-making processes concerned with how resources are to be spent . . . there will be tension, but that is what democracy is all about.

Participatory democracy is defined and described in the context of democratic theory by Salisbury, Cole, Pateman, Henderson, Hooyman, and Verba and Nie. Yin points out that, in comparison to other countries, Americans are strong in thinking that the ordinary person should be active in public affairs. Gilbert and Specht report that small group and industrial studies indicate that when people participate directly in decisions that impinge on their lives, they are more likely to feel a part of the community, decisions are more likely to be binding, and alienation and apathy are reduced. Bachrach notes the classical-normative view that survival of the system is contingent upon widespread participation. Rosenbaum agrees with some others that
the representative system should be reformed, but says that this would supplement participatory citizenship, rather than replace it. A negative view is expressed by Wheeler, who wrote in 1968 that participational democracy had failed, but that nothing had replaced it.

The general causes of the citizen participation movement have already been cited. The contributing effects of industrialization and urbanization are described by Nix and Dressel, and by Hutcheson and Steggart. Langton underscores the importance of the decline of mediating institutions (the church, political parties, fraternal organizations, etc.), the rise of the bureaucratic estate, and the impact of mass media.

More specifically, the literature identifies four primary forces that brought about the emergence of the Democratic Ideology Paradigm. They are the increase of (1) centralization, (2) bureaucratization-professionalization, (3) interest groups, and (4) technical knowledge as a replacement of values. The viability of a citizen participation depends upon its capacity to respond effectively to these forces.

One important force, centralization, applies to all geographical levels of our institutions, but it is most notable in relation to the federal role of government. As defined here, it is the geographical and political distance of decision-making from the population affected. There is now virtually no area of human services in which there is not some federal role. Even the tax exempt status of nonprofit organizations is in effect a subsidy which can and sometimes does serve as a conduit of federal influence. In regard to the concern about the bigness of the federal bureaucracy, Kahn says "The response is a search for planned decentralization which does not sacrifice the possibility of central
policy where it is appropriate." Yin, et al., cite the centralization of power in the federal government. Gilbert and Specht caution, however, that it may be more difficult to defend minority interests in smaller, decentralized, units; that larger units tend to be more progressive and command greater resources to attract expertise; and that some problems are beyond the scope of local initiative.

At the local level the concept of decentralization is employed in a way that is synonymous with citizen participation. Therefore, it is discussed further in a discussion of citizen participation variables in Chapter V. Briefly, the rationale is set forth by Cole, who says,

"Thus, from this perspective, current centralized and hierarchical methods of urban decision-making are lacking in responsiveness and efficiency, and citizen participation will, it is argued, correct these deficiencies to a significant degree."

Yin, found the effects of decentralization to be (1) improved understanding of neighborhood institutions and dynamics, (2) a strong human services orientation in public policy, (3) a counteracting of the trend for service bureaucracies to be accountable only to themselves, and (4) the bringing of the analysis of service problems down to the street level.

In reference to centralization at all levels, Caiden states that,

"Technocrats and rationalists have carried centralization to the point when decisions are made so far from the people for whom they are intended that they appear dehumanized, rigid, and insensitive. The people at the end of the line feel alienated from the anonymous "them", their own social institutions, and would like to resume more direct responsibility for ordering their own lives and environment."

Gilbert and Specht suggest that "community control", self-determination, "participatory democracy", and "local initiative" are catchwords that convey the strong feelings vested in the value of decentralization.
They go on to cite as presumed virtues of decentralization that local governments are more knowledgeable about problems in their areas, are more responsive to the special needs of constituencies, function more directly in line with constituency consent, can experiment more, and engender more meaningful community relationships than large centralized units. Yates concluded from a study that

"the message . . . is that decentralization is a hopeful and viable alternative in urban policy. Most important, decentralization holds the promise of creating more direct democracy than has ever existed before in American cities." Yates concluded from a study that

Gans attributes the low degree of political participation "to the fact that the impingement of government is often indirect and is not felt by the citizenry." As has been mentioned several places in literature, it is possible to support both centralization and decentralization at the same time at different levels of government.

A second force is bureaucratization and professionalization. The size and complexity of most operations has increased to the point that citizens do not feel they understand or can impact them. There is citizen suspicion that the officials in bureaucracies use the barriers to protect their own interests and values. Even citizens who are not disenfranchised or powerless have difficulty obtaining and using information to influence systems.

The literature is substantial on this point. According to Dorwart and Meyers, "The intricacy of bureaucratic organization in modern society has been widely noted as have the problems posed to citizens as they attempt to relate to bureaucratic structures." Gilbert says,
Neither the good will of professionalized workers . . . nor bureaucratic rationality is considered sufficiently reliable to secure responsiveness to recipient needs because both professional workers and organizations have multiple objectives, their own survival in the system being foremost.\(^8\)

Among others who have addressed the issue are Rosenbaum, Hooyman, Kahn, Kweit and Kweit, Stewart, and Judd and Mendelson.\(^8\)

Considerable attention has been given to the fact that the perceptions and values of officials are frequently different than those of the average citizen, and that these are reflected in decisions. Examples of evidence are studies that suggest that elected city officials are unable to predict the judgements of interest groups members,\(^9\) that the average city manager has conservative values,\(^10\) and that planners have a propensity to act in behalf of their values.\(^11\) The profession of urban planning has traditionally adopted a public stance of being value-neutral,\(^12\) and as seeing "protection of the public interest" as their unique calling and obligation.\(^13\) Among those who point out the limitations of this view are Stagner and Gans.\(^14\)

A third force responsible for the citizen participation movement is the increase of interest groups. While they perform a useful function in the provision of information,\(^15\) they often exercise persuasive influence that the average citizen cannot. They are themselves an expression of democracy\(^16\) and have opened up the political process\(^17\) but they tend to distort the public interest, reflecting an upper class bias and not representing some groups, especially the poor, adequately.\(^18\)

Wilson describes the increase of interest group activity:

Indeed, most commentators and politicians in the United States believe that interest groups are more important political actors today than they have been for some time. They have become more active and better organized
at the very time that other political actors, particularly parties, have become weaker. 101 Among others who have observed the increase are Hayes, 102 Henderson, 103 and the Department of Housing and Urban Development. 104

Gil attributes the strong role of interest groups to political pluralism, and says they cause policy to emerge from "a process of intrinsically unfair competition . . ." He calls for a political movement committed to equality and directed to the rights of all groups rather than merely for the special interests of some groups such as the currently deprived segments of society. Such a movement would not be directed against any segment of society. What it should be directed against is the principles of privilege, inequality, exploitation, injustice, oppression, and inhumanity . . . 105

Steiner sees the need to be for intercessor groups motivated by self-interest on behalf of aggrieved segments of the population, e.g., groups that can compete with other interest groups. 106

Cigler and Loomis attribute the increased significance of interest groups to growth of the middle class, increased activism of blacks and women, political party and campaign finance "reforms," the rising importance of mass media, and public distrust of the political process. 107

A fourth and final force is the displacement of values by technical knowledge in decision-making. There has already been discussion to the effect that social policy is determined by bringing facts together with the values of citizens, and that decisions of governmental officials are not value free. Assuming, however, that such decisions can be free of values of officials making them, there is still a problem. The technical capacity of society has become such that there is a tendency to look for technical answers to problems that are ultimately matters of values or
self-interests. The result is dissatisfaction on the part of citizens. Burdekin and Karl note the reference to the technical nature of information as a reason frequently given to limit involvement and defend decisions. Rein says the dilemma of facts versus values cannot be resolved, because it is an inherent contradiction in the American way of life. Hayek writes of the limits of democracy in relation to planning, and speculates that the "decision-making process in urban planning has become so intricate that the involvement of laymen has become either unfeasible or undesirable.

Even where technical considerations will prevail over predominant values, Kafoglis notes, citizen participation can contribute to consensus. The sharing of information, Henderson indicates, brings about value changes to accommodate technical developments.

Citizen participation of the Democratic Ideology Paradigm is, then, citizen participation that is designed to satisfy the alienation and distrust of citizens in relation to institutions that serve them, especially government: increased centralization, bureaucratization and professionalization, interest groups, and displacement of the role of values by technical developments. This doesn't mean that this is always the announced purpose; rather, it means that this is the result. A citizen program with an avowed purpose to produce major policy impacts may actually be structured in such a way as to involve much more modest policy influence, but to do so in a way that satisfies the needs of citizens to know what is going on and to be heard to a greater extent than would otherwise be the case. Conversely, it is possible, although less likely, that a program with an avowed intent to provide an opportunity for citizens to communicate with government can be structured in such a
way that it can become a major force in some major policy decisions.

Since, as has been pointed earlier, the intent has frequently been vague in legislative and administrative provisions for citizen participation, a wide range of structures and styles has resulted. The factors that determine the real purpose served have to a larger extent been locally determined. The goals established for citizen participation in a given government program have varied widely, and there has frequently been considerable disparity between avowed goals and actual results. The disparity may have reflected an unstated real desire on the part of those designing the local structure, or it may have been due to faulty conceptualization or subsequent intervening factors that produced a result different than that which was planned. In any case, citizen participation of the Democratic Theology Paradigm is that which responds to the needs attributed to the paradigm.

Citizen participation of this paradigm is basically an extension of the regular governmental system, either the elected representation or the administrative structure, or perhaps both. Its principal distinguishing characteristic is that it is designed to produce the same political influence on policies as the basic system of elected representation, but to increase the preciseness of the influence. The rationale is that of providing channels of communication between the governing authority and citizens for the purpose of supplementing the voice of the public as it is expressed through elections. The citizen participation mechanism is expected to provide greater access of information to citizens, thus combining facts and values in the citizen influence that is brought to bear on policy decisions. Presumably citizen satisfaction is increased because citizens have increased opportunities to
express their views, either directly or through supplementary representation, and because they perceive the effects of their influence in some decisions that are made.

The Democratic Ideology Paradigm stresses the "one-person-one-vote" view that all persons are politically equal. In this sense, it strengthens in a representative democracy the influence that would be produced by direct democracy. It does not envision any major shifting power between segments of society, but espouses the strengthening of the corporate will of citizens to offset the impact of special interest groups. The logical effect of citizen participation of this paradigm is to strengthen the will of the majority, in contrast to counter balances for minority interests.

The Democratic Ideology Paradigm incorporates citizen satisfaction with the basic social, political, and economic systems, and changes that result from citizen participation are expected to be small and incremental. Attention focuses on local issues of types that concern all citizens. Redistribution of resources is nominal.

The citizens participation is advisory in nature. The approach is one of cooperation. Considerations may deal with questions of both policy and administration, but function is limited to advice regarding such questions, and does not involve operational responsibilities.

More specific description appears in Chapter V, where the variables of citizen participation models are discussed.
The Social Reform Paradigm

The roots of this paradigm of citizen participation are in the social problems that came to the fore in the 1960's. The ultimate causal factors are very much the urbanization and industrialization mentioned before, but the citizen participation of this paradigm was fostered more by the goal of changing the conditions than by gaining understanding and alleviating alienation.

The problems included poverty, denial of civil rights, environmental abuses, crime, violence, exploding health costs, mental illness, family breakdown, shifts in the composition of the population on the basis of age and other factors, and urban sprawl and decay. These have been identified as symptoms of even more fundamental causes.

One fundamental cause cited was the incompatibility of human nature with the character of cities as they had developed to the 1960's. As Stearns and Montag state,

Urban environments in North America seem unable to support healthy human populations at tolerable levels of stress and to provide rich social and cultural opportunities. Technological changes have placed man increasingly at odds with his behavioral and perceptual patterns. Man is, it seems, increasingly out of place in the city, yet increasingly dependent upon it.

Contrast to the problems urban man faces is a general lack of sensitivity to man's biological nature and his relationship to his environment.

In hearings on the CDBG legislation, the National League of Cities, reflecting the decade of national concerns, cited among problems income maintenance policies which leads to a welfare system that permits one third of the nation's people to live without adequate income to sustain a decent standard of living. The League also criticized policies that permit gross inequities between metropolitan communities in the
provision of social services.\footnote{116}  

The political process is frequently blamed:

The scope of problems of the cities is matched by the fragmentation of the decision-making process. Governments, quasi-governments, private interests, and public lobbies compete for power in a structure never designed to produce the services now demanded of it.\footnote{117}

The inability or unwillingness of urban governments to respond to urgent social needs prompted frustration and suspicion on the part of those most affected:

The influx of poor and minority populations into many inner cities both revealed and exacerbated the problems of centralized urban government. When urban government failed to respond adequately to complaints of poor services... low-income black residents of inner city neighborhoods could neither alter nor avoid the city's failure to deliver the whole array of urgently needed services. Furthermore, the provider of services, in the eyes of many black residents of inner city neighborhoods..., was also the front line soldier of an oppressive white bureaucracy...\footnote{118}

"Poverty, unemployment, crime, drug abuse, alienation,, racism, mental disturbance and chronic mobility" were said to be "indications of population pressures under conditions of deteriorating social opportunity."\footnote{119}

Increasingly, the problems were attributed to inadequacies of basic social structure:

Public debate is increasingly premised on the assumption that something is wrong with either the way things are organized or with the socially prescribed way of doing things... The present mood is one of redistributing resources, of changing rules of the game, of righting the unbalance of power.\footnote{120}

Economic and physical conditions have been cited:

On the structural level, there is the necessity for a viable economic base that provides employment opportunities for all and for an assessed valuation high enough to yield real estate taxes needed to support public services on an adequate level. Along with these needs ride the whole complex of problems resulting
from the flight to the suburbs and the ghettoizing of the city center: the traffic congestion caused by flow to and from the suburbs; the inadequacy of city services due to falling land values and taxes in the ghetto area; the lack of middle-income housing, and so on through a long list.

Downs says factors in urban decline include "trickle down urban development" that makes new environments for the rich only, population trends, and urban social conditions such as racism and violence.

Warren cites change, in values as contributing to the problems, and mentions as an example what seems to be an increasing change of emphasis from work and production to enjoyment and consumption. Stagner says problems are aggravated by "frustrations for desires for status, security, and self-expression." Similarly, theorists have held that subjective feelings of deprivation and disadvantage have a greater effect on mobilizing people to better their conditions than do the objective circumstances of life.

The problems that contributed to the development of citizen participation in the 1960's were rooted in very basic social conditions, aggravated by perceptions of those citizens affected. The kinds of changes necessary to alleviate them had to impact the belief-value system dominant in American society, which holds that the society, though hardly perfect, is essentially sound in its institutional composition. And because democracy makes life steadily harder for the underdog as it opens opportunities to all comers, the citizen participation groups found their efforts frustrated in the context of conventional participatory democracy. With wide support from social science, a new concept of citizen participation was born.

It should be emphasized that the citizen participation of the 1960's and the 1970's developed its frequently strident form of urgency and its attempts at
comprehensiveness of control because it arose not from a philosophical belief in democracy, nor a belief in the duty of citizens to participate, but rather from basic, unfulfilled needs—both physical and social. In other contexts these conditions have produced revolutions; in the United States, because of both its constitutional provisions for change and the identification by a portion of its middle class intellectuals of the good of society with the needs and aspirations of the poor, the demand for citizen participation took the form of political and social pressure for increased citizen control.

Two of the objectives of the CDBG legislation are (1) the provision of decent housing and a suitable living environment, and (2) expanded economic opportunities, particularly for persons of low and moderate incomes. The program has been widely interpreted by HUD to be principally one of physical change, with human services permitted to the extent that they contribute to the physical change. Since this strictly concerns citizen participation in the CDBG context, the relationship between poverty and physical change is relevant in consideration of the Social Reform Paradigm of citizen participation. According to Webber, "We are coming to comprehend the city as an extremely complex social system, only some aspects of which are expressed as physical buildings or as locational arrangements. As the parallel, we are coming to understand that each aspect lies in a reciprocal causal relationship to all others." Gans says that outcomes of plans to change the physical environment have little impact on the behavior patterns of people, and that planning to change living conditions must address causes. Gans concludes that alleviation of poverty is crucial in planning directed toward urban restoration.

One of the most important tasks in the improvement of cities is the elimination of urban poverty and the deprivations of lower-class life. Poverty is fundamentally responsible for the slums, we have been unable to eradicate by attacking the buildings and for the
deprivation which ultimately brings about the familiar list of social evils.

Similarly, Downs says poverty "is the simple biggest cause of neighborhood deterioration and decline," and that the "best approach to improving urban neighborhoods would undoubtedly be to reduce poverty."132

McNully and Kliment say, "Of course, the prospects for large-scale increase of purely physical alterations in older cities are bleak unless the element of economic dependence of many of the people who live there is improved." The redevelopment of cities will lag unless something is done to improve the quality of life on urban streets, in the schools, and in the parks..."133

Physically, city areas go through a cycle of growth, maturity, decline, and renewal.134 The physical condition of different areas separates the population by income groups, with the poor being forced to live in the older, deteriorated areas.135 The result is that the poor bear the heaviest share of the costs of declining cities.136

Thus, the CDBG program is intended to address conditions that are deep-seated—the kind with which the Social Reform Paradigm of citizen participation is associated. This paradigm assumes that at least some shift of power is necessary to address such conditions. Arnstein refers to citizen participation as a categorical term for citizen power,137 and Mayer says, "If community organization is to result in social change it must achieve some redistribution of power that becomes institutionalized..."138

Parsons defines power as "the generalized capacity to mobilize resources in the interest of attainment of a system goal."139 The question of how power is distributed and exercised in the community has been the subject of considerable research and commentary over the last
three decades. Hunter contends in the report of a 1953 study that a small elite, made up primarily of business interests, predominates in the control of community decision-making. Dahl and Banfield found pluralistic rather than monolithic patterns of power characteristic of American communities. Subsequent studies suggested that a general continuum ranging from centralization to decentralization of power is more empirically accurate than the conceptions of either elitism or pluralism. The theories of community power are discussed extensively in the literature; including Burke, Kahn, McGill and Clark, and Rothman and Epstein. Berger and Neuhaus say that the "management mindset of the megastructure—whether HEW, Sears Roebuck, or the AFL-CIO—is biased toward the unitary solution," whereas the function of social policy is to provide diversified solutions to problems that are, after all, diversely caused and diversely defined.

Citizen participation of the Social Reform Paradigm is based on a pluralistic model of power. Its function is to introduce power on behalf of an otherwise powerless group into the pool of competing interests. Very few federal personnel talked during the antipoverty years of creating power forces which would impart resources distribution, but that was, at least in some measure, the thrust of much of the citizen participation. Although there is evidence, such as that of Warren, et al., and Edgar, that relatively little shifting of power took place, the experience led a number of writers to conclude that some shifts could be achieved, but not by government mandates. Edgar concluded that "Social systems of economic equality can be changed by people taking the power from corporate influentials unto themselves." Haveman notes that the powerless remained powerless, but that something was shared that didn't become completely recontained, and Peterson
mentions that local political systems were opened to previously ex-
cluded groups. 153

Thus, the distinction is drawn between citizen participation that is, on the one hand, basically communication between citizen and govern-
ment, and citizen participation that is, on the other hand, an effort to shift power as a means of achieving fundamental social changes. In both instances, the participation is a manifestation of democracy, but there are two interpretations of democracy. One is that democracy con-
sists primarily of the electoral process, and that the representative system is both strengthened and made more responsive to the public in-
terest, or the will of the majority, by a supplementary channel of com-
munication and influence. The other is that democracy is essentially competition between powered interests, and that the public interest in-
cludes minority interests, that involve basic changes that will come about only as the result of some shifting of power.

The Social Reform Paradigm of citizen participation emerged as a re-
sponse to a low feeling of political efficacy in low socio-economic areas because of the contemporary theory that democracy is the partici-
pation of a minority elite.154 It is to draw special groups, especially the low-income, into political participation which contrasts with "non-
political participation,"155 which has generally prevailed except in re-
lation to the antipoverty programs.156 Gilbert and Specht note this participation as a different interpretation of democracy than that em-
ployed by the middle-income population, and say that involving the poor as therapy and self-help or for the purpose of legitimation of activities does not take adequate account of the potential role that citizen par-
ticipation may have in politicizing the poor."157 Pollinger and
Pollinger contrast "participatory output," which encourages articulation of demands and the flow of communication across political boundaries, with "elitest output, which diverts demands to other areas, usually service agencies." 158

Various doubts have been expressed about the approach embodied in the Social Reform Paradigm. Among them are that integration of the poor into the basic democratic (electoral) system will best achieve the goals of more equitable benefits and greater opportunity for self-realization of the poor; 159 that efforts to achieve more moderate goals have a realistically better chance of success than goals of more significant social change; 160 that the programs with the greatest influence are those that attract the neighborhood elite, rather, than the average citizen, 161 and that it has not been demonstrated that participation concepts are applicable to larger-scale social problems, and change may be brought about through legislative and administrative channels without grass-roots participation. 162 Perlman reported in 1978 that spontaneous grass-roots groups had emerged because of the failure of both representative democracy and federally-mandated participation, and that they were becoming a social force. 163

The Social Reform Paradigm of citizen participation is one that assumes at least some redistribution of power in order to achieve specific fundamental changes in social and physical conditions, the economy, or the political system. Usually these changes involve redistribution of resources. It is motivated by needs and problems of minority interests, especially those of the poor. The predominant view of the political system is pluralist, with the participation designed to compete with other forces.
It should be pointed out that while the distinguishing force leading to the emergence of the participation programs of this paradigm was the existence of social problems and the desire to alleviate them, the forces that brought about the Democratic Ideology Paradigm (centralization), bureaucratization and professionalization, the rise of interest groups, and the displacement of the role of values by technology) were also factors.

In fact, these features were magnified by the institutionalized powerlessness of groups to be served by the changes. Thus, the participation of the Social Reform Paradigm is rooted in particularly strong, complex frustrations and motivations.

**Conclusion**

Because of confusion regarding the organization and purposes of federally mandated citizen participation programs, there have been recommendations that some uniform standards be developed. One major source of confusion appears to be a failure to distinguish between two clearly different phenomena. One is movement to relieve a general feeling of alienation from institutions by citizens as the result of centralization of decision-making, bureaucratization and professionalization, the rise of interest groups, and the displacement of the role of values by technology. The other is the movement to alleviate pervasive social needs and problems, and to generally enhance the cause of social justice and human wellbeing. Citizen participation emerged as a response to both during the 1960's. However, the citizen participation concepts and programs of the two movements were entirely different. For purposes of discussion here, they are termed the Democratic Ideology Paradigm and the Social Reform Paradigm.
The Democratic Ideology Paradigm is basically an extension of the regular representative governmental system. It provides communication between citizens and government as a means of facilitating the reflection of citizen influence on decisions. In the evolution of democratic theory, it is an expression of participatory democracy, which modified the contemporary, revisionist ideas that assigned a limited role to citizens beginning in the 1920's.

The Social Reform Paradigm seeks to shift power as a means of achieving changes in policies and systems. It is also an expression of participatory democracy, but it views democracy more as an arena of competing forces than as a representative system of government.

Figure 1 illustrates some differentiating features of the two paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Democratic Ideology Paradigm</th>
<th>Social Reform Paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Alienation</td>
<td>Social needs and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interests represented</td>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>Minority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Power shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy goals</td>
<td>Modest policy and operational changes</td>
<td>Basic institutional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution impact</td>
<td>Nominal redistribution</td>
<td>Significant redistribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of activity</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Policy and frequently administrative control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Cooperation and concensus</td>
<td>Conflict and competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Differentiating Features of Two Paradigms
Not all citizen participation programs fall clearly into one paradigm or the other. In fact, that is likely the reason for the ineffectiveness attributed to many of the programs. Some programs evolve from one paradigm to the other.

There is room for considerable variation within a paradigm. Both paradigms can be carried out with moderation, and both can be weak or strong expressions of their respective purposes.

In theory, the two paradigms are in conflict, even though both represent fulfillment of democratic ends. An example is that one paradigm articulates majority interests and the other minority interests. It is possible that through certain mechanisms both sets of interests can be accommodated to the general satisfaction of the citizenry. Still, the two represent two different interpretations of democracy, and multiple programs in a given community do experience conflict from this fact.

Both paradigms serve legitimate purposes. It is important that the purpose be clear in the case of each citizen participation program, and that the implementation and appraisal of the program be consistent with that purpose. Confusion has resulted in the past from failure to identify clearly the intent with regard to specific programs.
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CHAPTER IV
THE STUDY CONTEXT AND METHOD

The New Federalism

A particular emphasis of this study is the impact of the New Federalism on citizen participation. Federalism is the relationship between the central government and the states. This relationship has shifted dramatically since the early twentieth century, and the New Federalism is the current model.

Prior to about the 1930's, a state's rights model of federalism existed. This model holds that central and regional governments are separate and distinct from each other, and that each has its own sphere. The states were responsible for the domestic well-being of citizens, and the federal government had a residual role of assuming the functions that states could not handle individually, such as national security. The founding fathers clearly saw the states as the strongest entity in the intergovernmental system.

The economic depression of the 1930's changed this. The role of the federal government was greatly expanded into a pattern that has been described as "dual federalism," joint sovereignty of the federal and state governments. Although the government began to administer some federal aid funds directly, the more common pattern was the grant-in-aid, through which federal agencies channeled federal funds to state or local governments to administer. Most federal grants were of a categorical nature, stipulating rather specifically the purposes for which
the funds would be used. This pattern continued until the advent of the Great Society period in the mid-1960's.

In the 1960's, there was a surge of federal intervention into areas that had previously been local affairs, such as law enforcement and mass transportation. Federal-state-local interrelationship increased dramatically. The growth in federally-funded programs at the local level led to a need for local coordination, and by 1967, there were more than a dozen federally-initiated local coordinating structures that were common to urban communities.

Developments from the Great Depression to the present have been described as including three stages. The first is Co-operative Federalism, in which there was a mixing of the state and federal levels of government, in contrast to the earlier situation in which there were clearly two distinct levels.

The second stage is Creative Federalism. President Johnson used this phrase "creative federalism" to describe the Great Society, and Ways defines it as a condition in which the power of both the federal and state governments increased, and an increase on the part of one didn't decrease the power of the other. Magill said Creative Federalism marked the beginning of the trend to transfer some power to state and local governments, and it was the first time cities were recognized as a part of the federal system, with grants going to them.

The third stage is New Federalism. Briefly, it maintains the collection of funds by the federal government, but provides for the distribution of these funds to the states or local governments with few conditions attached. The rationale for federal collection is that (1) there is spillover of program benefits beyond local and state boundaries,
(2) the federal taxing ability is more efficient and equitable than that of other governments, and (3) communities are reluctant to tax themselves for programs of the poor, because other communities may gain an economic advantage by not similarly taxing themselves. The rationale for local discretion regarding use is, briefly, that better decisions about the use of funds can be made at the local level than at the federal. This will be dealt with more in detail in discussions of specific programs below.

In the meantime, a development that has occurred during the evolution of the New Federalism, and sometimes as an integral element of it, is the return to inclusion of the state in the federal grant system. In the decade or so that culminated with the Great Society, there was a growing view that states, as a level of government, had outlived their usefulness, and that their governments were unrepresentative, unresponsive, and inefficient. The federal government, more so than previously, bypassed the states in the distribution of funds. Beginning with the Law Enforcement Assistance Act and continuing through the Reagan block grant programs, the state has once again gained prominence in the federal grant process.

In summary, the basic dilemma of federalism is how to achieve goals and objectives established by the national government through local and state governments that are independent and politically may be even hostile. This writer perceives four general patterns of intergovernmental relationships that have existed in relation to social programs:

1. State/local collection of funds, and state/local expenditure of them.
2. Federal collection of funds and direct federal expenditure of them.
3. Federal collection of funds, and granting of the funds to local state units for expenditure for federally determined purposes.

4. Federal collection of funds, and granting of the funds to local/state units for purposes determined at the local/state levels.

The evolution of federalism from about the 1930's to the present is described well by Fessler, Kettl, Barfield, and Reagan. With the growing complexity of American society, intergovernmental relations themselves become more complex. At any one time, a mixture of the four patterns exists, sometimes even within a single program.

This has been an overview for introducing a more detailed discussion of New Federalism and the specific programs that it encompasses.

The New Federalism was introduced during the administration of President Richard Nixon. Typical of the statements in support of the New Federalism concept were those of the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who said that the Model Cities "planned variations" project had demonstrated that when communities are given greater flexibility, "the first thing they do is respond by assuming greater responsibility." Lundquist and Davis say that decisions on community problems made at the community level are potentially better than those at the national level, because only at the community level can the community be seen whole, only there can all the problems be interrelated, only there can the systems of comprehensive planning and program coordination be established and operated, and only there can widespread citizen participation be organized and the contributions of the citizens blended with those of its professionals.

Typical of descriptive statements concerning the New Federalism and its history are the following:

Richard Nixon responded in his 1971 State of the Union message with a call for a "New Federalism," a strategy to shift power in the federal system by changing the system of funding intergovernmental
programs. More important perhaps, to eliminate the supposedly onerous nature of federal guidelines and the heavy hand of federal administrators . . ., Community Development block grants were to be governed only by minimal federal requirements and equally minimal federal prerequisites.19

The opening statement of the Republican Party platform leaves no doubt as to the support of decentralization of the federal government: "The Republican Party reaffirms its belief in the decentralization of the federal government, and in the traditional American principle that best government is the one closest to the people . . . block grants and revenue-sharing provide local government with the means and flexibility to solve their own problems in ways most appropriate for each locale . . .."21

The mechanism for implementing the New Federalism was labelled revenue-sharing. The Nixon administration proposal was for a general revenue-sharing program and four special revenue-sharing programs. A variation from the special revenue-sharing concept is that of block grants. The three concepts were defined as follows:

General revenue sharing provides funds to be used at local discretion without strings, distributed according to a formula and without need for an application. Special revenue sharing may have a formula, it may require an application, and the funds must be spent within a broad subject area, such as law enforcement, but no prior federal approval is required to use it for any one of a large number of activities under that heading. Block grants will require an application, may require prior federal approval, will be subject to more federal control but far less than the old-fashioned categorical programs . . .22

President Nixon's special revenue-sharing proposals were not implemented, and block grants became the vehicle for accomplishing the same purpose. The revenue-sharing approach succeeded categorical grants, and recently categorical grants were defined as those which "in most cases, can be used only for specific, narrowly defined purposes," general revenue-sharing grants as those "distributed to state and local governments by
formula, with few limits on the purposes for which it may be spent and few procedural restrictions," and block grants as those of a middle ground in which funds are provided chiefly to general purpose governmental units in accordance with a statutory formula for use in a broad functional area largely at the recipient's discretion.23

General revenue-sharing came into existence under the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972. It has resulted in amounts determined by formula being allocated to 39,000 townships, counties, cities, and states every year since it became effective. There have been few conditions attached to receipt of the funds. The program was originally proposed by Walter W. Heller, chairman of President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisors, in 1964, who endorsed it as a means of plowing back into the economic system some revenue surpluses expected from the economic stimulus of a major tax cut, and Congressman Melvin R. Laird, in 1967.24

Although they began before President Nixon's introduction of the New Federalism, the Community Action Program and the Model Cities program have been described as block grant programs.25 They were different than the typical categorical grant program, in that they involved local choices and planning. Still, they were much more limited in versatility than the block grant programs that succeeded them.

The block grant of relevance here is that which succeeded the Model Cities program. During the Nixon administration, a number of bills were introduced in Congress for establishing a special revenue-sharing program to deal with problems of urban development. The best known was the Better Communities Act. In 1974, after President Nixon left office, the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program was
enacted as Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

Except for the General Revenue-Sharing, the block grant has been the mechanism for implementing the New Federalism idea. President Ronald Reagan greatly expanded the number of block grant programs soon after his election, combining a number of categorical programs to form each block grant program. Barfield says that the Reagan administration's block grant programs more nearly resemble the Nixon administration's special revenue-sharing proposals than they do the previously introduced block grant programs.26

Since the introduction of the New Federalism, particularly in the early years, there has been considerable study and analysis of the concept. In addition to arguments already noted in support of it, there were other positive observations and conclusions. Terrell mentioned the expectation of founders that it would enhance innovation.27 While noting disadvantages, Downs seems to prefer policy-making at the local level, citing the fact that American cities "vary enormously in population, areas, density, climate, age, reliance upon public transportation, growth rates, economic vitality, age distribution of the population, form of government, amount of housing vacancy and abandonment, crime rates and stability."28 Referring to the CDBG legislation, Frej and Specht said. . .

The Act has the potential to impact new vitality into local governments, ability to provide for physical and social needs. . . With this shift in control and responsibility, whereby local government becomes the focal point for community planning, major challenges await professionals engaged in social welfare policy analysis and planning with local governmental and voluntary community organizations.29
Objective research evaluation and analysis from the perspective of social welfare goals has generally, however, been less positive. Among conclusions and observations have been that priorities for expenditure have shifted to the suburban fringe; the expenditures for the poor and minorities have shifted toward social control; redistribution of fiscal resources to poor localities has dropped; allocations for social services for the poor have become inversely related to indices of need; federal standards in areas such as health care, education, and housing would be threatened; decisions have come to be made on the basis of interest group influence, rather than on objective criteria; influence of lower-means residents would become dispersed; the really major problems can't be resolved at the local level; rather than alleviating the gap between government agencies and people, revenue-sharing may just transfer it to state and local levels; historically, federal government has been more accessible to poor and minorities than state government; needed reform of the economic and social structure of cities cannot be brought about through purely local action, and, contrary to the idea that local governments are closer to the people, the poor and racial and ethnic minorities get no more information or consideration from local governments than they do federal.

As mentioned earlier, local governments are not smaller versions of the federal government, and the shifting of decisions to them is placing the decisions in an entirely new environment. Peterson points out that local governments place great weight on economic productivity, not because of control by elites or constituency politics, but because, unlike national governments, they have little control over external socioeconomic forces. Since they can't control the flow of labor
and capital across their boundaries, they are in competition, and they therefore stress efficiency as a means of protecting their economic base. The concern for economic considerations tends to take priority over concern for equality of opportunities and goods for people.  

Another factor is that political leaders pursue objectives of those who select them, and local government caters to economic interests, rather than the less well-organized interests of other groups, whereas the federal government serves broader and more diffuse interests.

During the period of categorical grants, a number of federal programs required the establishment of local special-purpose agencies for their administration. A principal effect of revenue-sharing was to transfer responsibility from these agencies to local general governments. Since the special purpose agencies were governed by appointed boards and commissions, the effect of the transfer was to enhance the role of the chief executive and the elected officials. This presumably tended to shift decision-making influence to the general electorate from special interests. Frej and Specht have analyzed the advantages of disadvantages of the special purpose agencies. While it is not important here to go into these, it was held that the shift should open up opportunities for citizen involvement.

Aside from the limited experience of Model Cities Planned Variations, the first opportunity to view citizen participation in the New Federalism context was in relation to General Revenue-Sharing. The expectations were mixed, but the prevailing sense seemed to be that citizen participation would be enhanced. The only requirements were that recipients prepare planned and actual use reports, and to publish them in a newspaper of general circulation, and that states' laws be
observed with regard to hearings on and publishing of budgets.45

One of the main purposes of revenue-sharing, as propounded by the Nixon administration was to return decision-making to the local level where citizens would have more "say" than they did under Washington-dominated categorical grants. President Nixon said revenue-sharing would be a catalyst for democracy, shifting decisions from out-of-touch Washington bureaucrats to grass-roots citizens most knowledgeable about the programs.46 The Office of Management and Budget stressed the important role of participation in the New Federalism.47

In a study of General Revenue-Sharing, Terrell addressed the question of the effect of revenue-sharing on participation. His conclusions were that initially General Revenue-Sharing had a salutary effect on participation.48 He found that revenue-sharing spending decisions followed the recommendations of advisory boards and other "official" evaluation bodies.49 He further reported as follows:

The major findings of the study support the New Federalism thesis that unrestricted funds will strengthen local government and stimulate democratic participation. In the seven Pacific Coast sites investigated. . . revenue-sharing funds have increased social welfare commitments, improved the integrated planning for social problem solving, and accommodated and promoted the community involvement of individuals and private agencies.50

Despite the study results, Terrell believed the future of citizen participation was uncertain.51 Cole concluded that changing patterns of federalism were the major factor in influencing citizen participation, and he predicted that in revenue-sharing there would be a reduction in citizen participation activities, but that participation programs would not be totally abolished. Participation would, he believed, become
more associated with larger cities, legally weak mayors, larger proportions of blacks and high levels of urban violence. Magill concluded that in those programs controlled totally by local government, such as general revenue-sharing, local communities may be responsive to organized neighborhood groups. Chan found that in cities he studied, the majority of local governments were reluctant to have citizens involved in General Revenue-Sharing allocative decision making, and most groups were passive in participation.

Municipal executives believed the Better Communities Act, an early version of what became CDBG, would increase participation. Another view, however, was that the Act was not adequately strong in support of participation.

Other relevant observations have been that under New Federalism, Congress has little power or will to be interventionist in citizens participation, so it is a determination of local government; revenue-sharing tends to insulate local officials from citizen involvement; and during the New Federalism period, the federal government has drifted from fostering participation to building local political leadership.

The Community Development Block Grant Program

The CDBG program was enacted in August, 1974. It combined seven federally-funded programs into one, giving local communities considerable latitude in determination of how the funds would be used within the broad context of community development.

President Gerald Ford said the following concerning CDBG purposes:

This bill climaxes years of efforts to replace the original programs of the past with a more flexible approach . . .

This bill will help to return power from the banks of the Potomac to people in their own communities. Decisions will be made at the local level.
Action will come at the local level and responsibility for results will be placed squarely where it belongs at the local level.

Silverman has described the CDBG legislation as a middle course between a strong federal role and an unqualified shift to local control. In contrast to General Revenue-Sharing, CDBG requires an application, and its funds are unlikely to replace local taxes as support for existing public services.

The seven programs replaced are Open Spaces, Public Facility Loans, Water and Sewer Grants, Neighborhood Facilities Grants, Urban Renewal, Model Cities, and Rehabilitation Loans. The law states that the primary objective is to develop "viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income." Among the more specific objectives are the (1) elimination of slums and blight and the prevention of blighting influences, (2) the elimination of conditions detrimental to health, safety, and public welfare, (3) the conservation and expansion of the Nation's housing stock, (4) the expansion and improvement of the quantity and quality of community services, (5) a more rational use of land and natural resources, (6) the reduction of the isolation of income groups within communities, and an increase in the diversity and vitality of neighborhoods, and (7) the restoration and preservation of properties of special value for historical, architectural, or esthetic reasons. The law further states that it encourages development activities that are consistent with comprehensive planning, and that it is to further the national housing goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family.
For purposes of administration, HUD has determined that the pro-
gram provides funds for three general goals: the elimination of slums
and blight, the needs of low and moderate-income families, and urgent
local community development needs. Frej and Specht interpret the CDBG
program as having four major objectives: the meeting of needs of the
low and moderate-income, citizen participation in the development of
the application, use of funds in development of a comprehensive community
development strategy, and provision of evidence that the strategy will
"enhance urban viability, prevent . . . blight, and encourage neighbor-
hood revitalization." Kellams states the objectives as (1) consolida-
tion of previously separate grant programs to simplify application
procedures, (2) encouragement of greater flexibility and discretion by
local governments, and (3) development of an increased local leadership
role in identifying overall community development needs. Nathan de-
fines the basic intent, based on the legislative history, as support
for new and ongoing physical development activities, rather than for
social services.

The CDBG law was amended in 1977. The chief changes were "social
targeting," which was increased emphasis on benefits to the low and
moderate-income; strengthened citizen participation requirements; and
addition of economic development as an eligible use of funds. A
change in regulations in 1979 introduced and encouraged use of the
Neighborhood Strategy Area concept, under which public services (social
services) expenditures were limited to areas selected for physical re-
habilitation emphasis.

The law was further amended by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation
Act of 1981. Under the power granted by these amendments, the Reagan
administration eliminated the requirement for a formal CDBG application.
Rules requiring that a certain percentage of CDBG funds (75 percent under the Carter administration) benefit low and moderate-income people were rescinded; the requirements for comprehensive strategies were de-emphasized; and the restrictions on eligible activities, particularly social services, were reduced.69

A number of studies have been done concerning the effects of CDBG, especially during the early years. The results have been generally consistent, usually identifying the following in comparison to earlier programs: a substantially more influential role for chief executives and generalist policy-making officials, usually at the expense of independent agencies; a "spreading" or "distributive" (in contrast to earlier "redistributive") effect, with benefits being spread over much more of the population; increased capital expenditures; increased expenditures for conservation and prevention of blight, rather than slum clearance; greater support of public works; lower proportion of expenditures for the moderate and low-income population; greater flexibility in local decision-making; more focus on transitional areas, rather than severely deteriorated areas; and more, but less conflictual political participation. Among the researchers reporting findings along these lines are Nathan,70 National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials,71 Department of Housing and Urban Development, (HUD),72 Straub,73 Dommel, et al.,74 Kettl,75 and Plant and White.76 HUD said in 1982 that CDBG legislative influence was oriented toward inclusion of specific activities, rather than seeking to impose a broad development strategy.77

According to Kettl, the many studies of CDBG that were conducted in the early years almost universally condemned the program. Critics focused largely on the fact that there was no real planning for the use
of the money, and that funds were dispersed throughout communities so much that the impact was diminished, especially in easing the plight of the poor. 78

A subject of considerable study has been the relationship between geographical sections of communities and purposes for which funds have been allocated. Specifics have varied, depending upon the amount of grass-roots influence there has been in the decision-making, but the general pattern has been consistent from community to community. Findings of Kettl, 79 Parker, 80 and others agree generally that in suburban and higher-income areas the priorities tend toward public works projects, parks, and economic development, while in lower-income areas, the priorities favor social services and housing rehabilitation. Overall, the top priority for expenditures has been conservation, improvement, and expansion of housing stock. This has been followed by, in order, community services and facilities, public works, elimination of slums and blight, and economic development. 81 Although, some reports vary, they suggest that between 45 and 70 percent of the expenditures have been in areas where low and moderate-income persons predominate, with about 50 percent being the most typical.

Citizen Participation in CDBG

A key concept in the CDBG program is community development. It is important here, because by most definitions it is a process characterized by citizen participation. The original intent of the CDBG legislation with regard to community development and citizen participation was intentionally stated with vagueness. 82 The revenue-sharing philosophy of CDBG is to give communities wide latitude in determining the
nature of their local programs. Nevertheless, CDBG has frequently been viewed as a community development program within the general use of the term, and thus the concept is relevant in this writing.

Community development has been variously defined as a process, a method, a program, a movement, and a product. The literature contains extensive discussions of what community development is, and most practitioners and scholars consider it to be a process. Based on analysis of 20 definitions by different authors, Christenson and Robinson define community development as "(1) a group of people, (2) in a community, (3) reaching a decision, (4) to initiate a social action process (i.e. planned intervention), (5) to change (6) their economic, social, cultural, or environmental situation." Sabre offers as a definition "the activity of participating in community responses to changes in internal or external environment which help the survival of or enhance the quality of life for those living in the community." Macheracher says community development is a means of accomplishing a change in (1) the resources of the community, (2) the problem-solving and decision-making process and structure, and/or (3) the competencies of individual community members. Among others who have similarly defined and described the concept are Khinduka, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, Dobbs, Littrell, Apgar, Koneya, Warren, Gittel, Meyer and Gamm, and Wileden.

Review of the literature suggests that community development is generally viewed as consisting of certain qualities. Among them are these:

1. Goals which include both an external change and capacity-building.
2. Concern for both social and physical conditions.
3. A "social justice" value orientation.
5. Negotiation, rather than confrontation strategies (but not ruling out conflict).
6. Activity at the local grass roots level.
8. Emphasis on innovation.
10. Some organizational and leadership structure.
11. Facilitative technical assistance.
12. Broad involvement and participation.

It is not clear whether the CDBG legislation took into consideration these qualities or intended that they apply to the "community development" character of the program. As stated previously, the program has been administered as primarily a physical development program, and there is strong reason to suggest that framers of the legislation viewed "community development" as the process by which physical development would be achieved.

For purposes here, the importance is that, in most definitions, citizen participation is essential to community development. The constitution of the Community Development Society cites as one of its four purposes "Promoting citizen participation as essential to community development." Spergel says of the role of participation in community development:

The heart of the process of community development, especially since the 1960's, has been participation. The assumption has been that a variety of community problems--poverty, deviance, failures at school, lack of vocational skills, political apathy--may be resolved by participation of people in appropriate local and organizational and community activities. The more people participate, the less powerless they would become. An improved image of personal capacity and social, even political, potential would develop. They would increase their ability to exercise influence over the institutions and programs that controlled their destiny.
Ravitz emphasizes the link to democracy:

Community development is a process available to people of whatever political persuasion . . . to be used alike by people of liberal, conservative or radical ideology . . . Community development then is, but another name for old fashioned grass-roots participation, a phenomenon we have had and encouraged in our society from its beginning . . . Who could argue convincingly that in a democratic society, the people shouldn't be heard and indeed heeded . . . ?

Others who have particularly stressed the importance of meaningful participation in community development are Riddle, Blakely, Koneya, Dorwart and Meyers, and McKee, et al.

Some writers have stressed the fact that participation in community development is "negotiation politics," rather than an adversary form of community organization. Among those emphasizing this distinction are Cassidy, Perlman, and Dorwart and Meyers.

While the legislative intent is unclear, President Nixon defined community development as including "opportunities for the participation of private individuals and voluntary organizations in government decisions affecting the community." The Congressional testimony regarding the nature of community development included these representative statements:

> The basic principle of the process is that there are several components necessary in the development of a well-planned community . . . physical, environmental, social, financial, economic, governmental, and management . . . and each plays an integral role in the life of the community.

> The act never defines "community development." Instead, it offers a series of objectives and a list of activities which qualify for funding . . . When taken as a whole, these encompass a very wide range of undertakings which has come to be known as community development.

The testimony with regard to citizen participation provisions in the legislation tended to support continuance or strengthening of citizen participation as it existed in the Model Cities program.
Some of the testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs, Committee on Banking, Housing and Affairs, U.S. Senate, in 1973 is as follows, summarized and referenced by page number in the report of the hearings:\textsuperscript{112}

- **International City Managers Association**, p. 517, "A community's application should demonstrate that citizen input into the program has been encouraged and facilitated by a process determined by each individual community."

- **National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors**, p. 465, Cities should be required to certify they have involved citizens, particularly citizens residing in areas where block grant activities will be concentrated, in planning of the local program.

Testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, in 1973, included the following, summarized and referenced by page number in the report of the hearings:\textsuperscript{113}

- **Urban League, Inc.**, p. 1722, The citizen participation provisions of the original bill should be strengthened "to insure that local units do not engage in mere windowdressing on otherwise blunt citizen participation."

- **Brookings Institution**, p. 1325, The Community Action Program and Model Cities target political action skills to the disadvantaged that should be beneficial in CDBG.

- **American Institute of Planners**, p. 752-53, Citizens at large and citizens in neighborhoods affected would be best protected from abuses by specific plans for citizen participation that could be understood by laypersons.

- **City Demonstration Agency, Athens, Georgia**, p. 442, The citizen participation plan should assure adequate opportunity for meaningful participation, should be citywide, and should provide for citizens to influence, but not make, decisions.

- **Model Cities Directors Association**, pp. 438-39, "... the case remains indisputable that in most of the Model Cities communities, citizens and their local governments are now operating under a system which provides citizens access to decision-making in local governments."
In 1977, when CDBG was extended under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1977, testimony viewed compliance on citizen participation requirements as having been weak, and most witnesses favored stronger, more specific requirements. Among the organizations and individuals testifying to this effect, referenced by page number in the report of the hearings by the House of Representative's subcommittee, are the Southern Regional Council, pp. 770-71; the National Urban Coalition, p. 986; the Working Group on Community Development Reform, p. 795; Victor Bach, Assistant Professor, University of Texas, pp. 635, 642, 644-46; and Bernard J. Friedan and Marshall Kaplan, pp. 648, 692, 700-01.

A report of the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs indicates that the CDBG legislation was purposefully vague about citizen participation requirements. The report said the committee "agreed there is no single definition..." and "decided that program objectives would be better served by relying on local authorities to develop acceptable models taking into account the varied traditions and public institutions..."  

Section 104(a) of the 1974 CDBG legislation states that,

... no grant may be made unless the applicant provides satisfactory assurance that before submission of its application, it has (1) provided citizens with adequate information on the amount of funds available for proposed...activities, the range of activities that may be undertaken and other important program requirements, (2) held public hearings to obtain the views of citizens on community development and housing needs, and (3) provided citizens with an adequate opportunity to participate in the development of the application. The Act makes clear, however, that the responsibility for developing and executing the community development programs lies with the local government and is not restricted by citizen participation.
HUD said in an information publication that the purpose of the participation requirement was to assure that "community development programs will be responsive to local needs and will have more broadly based community support." In addition, it said, participation could also,

(1) provide a mechanism through which local government could resolve problems;
(2) provide citizen input in the development of bond issues or other matters requiring majority approval;
(3) reduce citizen alienation from city government; and
(4) enhance citizen capabilities to hold local government accountable for the effectiveness and efficiency of the CDBG program. 118

The latitude provided to local communities was intended to encourage broad public participation, at the expense of influence by low-income persons and neighborhoods. 119 This did occur, and the more diffuse impact of participation effected program allocations to the disadvantage of the low-income. 120 Downs said that the arrangements that resulted in most cities are inadequate in terms of attracting private capital, educating citizens and local officials concerning problems and potentials, and establishing really effective participation at both neighborhood and citywide levels. He said that the program is designed to be a local self-help project, and that it will be ineffective if the "helpers" are not involved in a significant role in making decisions. 121

Early in the program, Frey and Specht said it would require a restructuring of local government, because it would require citizen participation in relation to the general government with all of its various departments. This would be in contrast to previous linking of participation with special-purpose agencies, which tended to be insulated
from general government and not very accessible through common electoral and political processes. 122

The 1977 CDBG amendments expanded the scope of citizen participation but continued to be neutral on its structure. The legislation was strengthened by requiring that (1) recipient governments prepare a written plan for citizen participation, thereby increasing accountability to HUD and to citizens, (2) opportunities be provided to all citizens to submit comments on local program performance, these comments to be submitted with the application, and (3) there be encouragement of participation by residents of blighted neighborhoods and low and moderate-income citizens. 123

The regulations that followed further defined the scope and form of citizen involvement. They called for continuity of participation in all phases of the CDBG process—application development, program implementation, and monitoring and evaluation. There was provision for both community-wide and neighborhood level participation processes, the latter for neighborhoods designated as comprehensive revitalization areas. The regulations proposed that local advisory bodies include adequate representation of low and moderate-income persons, members of minority groups, and others affected by the program. There were more specific requirements than previously for dissemination of information, and, in a major new initiative, outside sources and local government staff were allowed to provide technical assistance to citizen participants. 124

Going beyond the regulations, in 1978 President Carter issued an executive order entitled "Improving Government Relations" in which opportunities for public participation were ordered. A short time later, he announced his urban policy, which put emphasis on the importance of
involving citizens at the neighborhood and community levels.\textsuperscript{125}

The 1981 amendments to the CDBG legislation sharply reduced citizen participation requirements. The only requirements of the 1981 law are that (1) citizens must be furnished information about the amount of money available and how it will be used, (2) a proposed statement of spending plans must be published to provide an opportunity for comment, and (3) one or more public hearings must be held.\textsuperscript{126} Gone are the requirements for written participation plans, information access procedures, and citizen advisory boards. The requirement for an application was eliminated. The Senate report, said the change was to achieve procedural simplification, and went on to say that the Senate majority...

\ldots is convinced that adequate and effective citizen participation is a well established element of the community development process. \ldots our decision not to do (include detailed procedures) was based on the inappropriateness of rigid legislative prescriptions, not on a lack of concern about the importance of citizen participation.\textsuperscript{127}

The Democratic minority responded that the changes "would virtually wipe out the citizen participation plan that makes citizens part of the community development process.\textsuperscript{128} Separate from CDBG but paralleling its consideration, a bill was introduced in the Senate that would have barred federal funding for all citizen involvement.\textsuperscript{129}

Dommel reports that when CDBG was first implemented, local executives exercised their prerogatives to assure that citizen participation was organized to be conflict-free.\textsuperscript{130} Various studies have revealed that most communities have exceeded the minimum participation requirements throughout the program's life. A 1978 survey of the Advisory Committee on Intergovernmental Relations revealed that two-thirds of the municipalities had advisory committees, usually appointed.
Specifically 65.4 per cent had advisory committees, 93.4 per cent held public hearings, 71.3 per cent published the application for public information, and 76.4 per cent provided for public inspection of the application. Of the communities with citizen organizations, most have had advisory groups, compared with lesser numbers of neighborhood-based groups and special-interest groups. Other approaches reported for meeting the citizen participation requirement have been citizen surveys and invitations to organizations to submit proposals. Among descriptions of a number of specific local programs are those of HUD and Lawrence Johnson and Associates, Inc., who published a catalogue of programs. The number of communities with advisory bodies increased after the 1977 amendments, and in 1982 Dommel reported as a result of a study of 10 programs that participation efforts stayed about the same following the 1981 amendments.

The effectiveness of citizen participation in local programs has usually been measured in terms of influence on local CDBG programs and allocations. Annual HUD reports, using data submitted by local communities have consistently indicated that citizen participation was among the most influential factors in determining the contents of CDBG applications. In the first year, for example, citizen participation was cited as the most influential factor with prominent mention by 56 per cent of the reporting communities. A similar, but perhaps less strong, conclusion has been reported by Dommel, et al., Kettl, and Connor, among others. There are those who disagree, however, such as the director of an organization which provides technical assistance to neighborhood groups. He says he "does not believe that the traditional participation mechanisms have resulted in more sympathetic targeting of
In summary, CDBG was conceived as a moderate, compromise expression of New Federalism. It is a revenue-sharing program, but in its original form its funding was contingent upon more conditions than characterizes pure revenue-sharing. One condition was a requirement for citizen participation. The law and regulations required that citizens be provided information and have the opportunity to be involved in determination of CDBG programs and allocations, but they specified that actual allocative decisions would be made by the local governing body. Communities were given wide latitude about how they would meet the requirement. Most communities used approaches that, in comparison to earlier participation programs, diffused participation. Most studies suggest that participation mechanisms were influential in the determination of local CDBG programs, but, because of the diffusion of participation, the influence contributed to a spreading of allocations from lower-income areas and people to the community-at-large. Amendments to the law in 1981 largely removed the citizen participation requirement, and the effect of this has not yet been reported.

The Wichita Community

Wichita is a city of about 180,000 people in the south central area of Kansas. After a large surge of population in the 1950's due to its expanding aircraft industry, it has levelled off in size and is now experiencing slow growth. It is the largest city in Kansas, and is the regional center for much of the southern and western part of the state. Except for Wichita, the area consists largely of agricultural land and small towns and cities.
The city is expanding in geographic size. This is due to a drop in the number of persons living in a single household (from 3.1 in 1960 to 2.5 in 1980) and the movement of population from the inner city to the fringes. Wichita has until recently been relatively free from being hemmed in by surrounding incorporated areas. This permitted the city to move its boundaries outward to include most of the population area, and it protected the city from the eroding tax base experienced by many urban centers. Recently this changed, as an adjacent community incorporated to prevent being annexed to Wichita. A lawsuit by the city of Wichita failed to prevent the incorporation.

Wichita is the hub of a two-country Metropolitan Statistical Area. The population of the area 411,313, an increase of 68,082 from 1960 to 1980.

Wichita's economy is based largely on agriculture, aircraft manufacturing, and oil drilling and refining. In recent years its livestock trading and slaughtering facilities and much of its packing plant capacity have closed, but it continues to be heavily involved in wheat storage and milling, and in other aspects of agriculture. Because it had as many as 13 aircraft manufacturers at one point in the early days of flying, Wichita has been long claimed the title of "Air Capitol of the World." It is now the headquarters for three aircraft producers (Beech, Cessna, and Lear Jet), has a large Boeing plant, and is home for numerous aircraft subcontractors. Up until about 10 years ago, the city was highly vulnerable to vacillations in the aircraft market, and although such vulnerability still exists, it has been moderated by diversification into other industries such as recreational products. New exploration has revived what ten years ago was a dying oil industry.
Compared to other urban areas throughout the country, Wichita usually enjoys a relatively high employment rate. However, unemployment rose from 3.6 per cent in 1980 to 10.5 per cent in 1982, and then moved to 4.5 per cent in mid-1984.

Wichita is heavily identified with national defense. McConnell Air Force Base is located there, and much of the nation's military aircraft production has occurred there. A ring of Titan missiles around the city is being deactivated.

Demographically, the city compares with the nation, the state of Kansas, and selected other urban areas in the area as follows:

| TABLE 1: SELECTED POPULATION CHARACTERISTICS FOR SELECTED GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS, BY PER CENT* |
|-----------------------------------------------|--------|---------------|
| CHARACTERISTICS, BY PER CENT                  |        |
| Below Poverty Level                           |        |
| Below 62 Years                                |        |
| U.S.                                          | 12.1   | 12.4          |
| Kansas                                        | 5.3    | 10.1          |
| Wichita, KS.                                  | 10.8   | 7.2           |
| Kansas City, MO.                              | 41.7   | 10.7          |
| Tulsa, OK.                                    | 11.3   | 7.3           |
| Lincoln, NE.                                  | 2.0    | 5.4           |


A comparison of the geographical distribution of persons by race, indicates that the community experienced substantial desegregation between 1970 and 1980. In 1970, more than half the city had less than two per cent minorities, and in 1980 there was almost no area with less than two per cent. 
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Wichita has a city manager form of government. The governing body is politically a nonpartisan Board of City Commissioners (City Commission) made up of five commissioners elected at-large for four-year, staggered terms. The Commission is chaired by the mayor, who is elected annually by the commissioners. Except for presiding at commission meetings, the mayor position is largely ceremonial. The commissioners serve part-time. The commission meets each Tuesday, beginning at 9 a.m. and usually lasting throughout the day.

By action of the commission, Wichita voters will vote in November, 1984, on a plan for representation on a district basis. Voters have rejected several previous efforts to change the form of representation. The proposal this time would divide the city into five districts. The two top vote-getters selected in a primary from each district would be candidates in a general election. Voting in the general election would be at-large, with voters throughout the city selecting from the two candidates of a district the person to be on the commission from that district. The procedure is designed to prevent ward politics or "pork-barrelling," while at the same time assuring representation from throughout the city. Wichita has in recent history had few commissioners from outside the relatively affluent east and northwest areas. Currently, three commissioners are from a single northwest Citizen Participation Organization (CPO) area. (See the CPO description in next chapter). The main thrust for changing the system of representation has come from the predominantly black near-northeast section, but is also believed to have strong support from the lower-middle-class southwest section. This vote on this issue has significance for the CPO, inasmuch as one of the justifications of the CPO is that it provides decision-making influence.
from all areas of the city.

Wichita government is supported largely by ad valorem taxes on property. Several efforts to introduce a sales tax have been rejected by voters, and Kansas law does not provide for local income taxes.

Wichita is a relatively new city, having been founded in 1861. It has not had the extensive physically deteriorated areas that have characterized many older urban communities. Much of the urban renewal activity was focused on the downtown core area. Through the natural system of supply and demand, the near-downtown area is largely transitional, changing from residential to commercial uses as the population moves outward. One section of older homes in a formerly affluent area is being preserved. It is the north central section, and it is being maintained through a neighborhood association of residents interested in the historic qualities.

Politically, Wichita is a point of moderation in a generally conservative state. There is strong spirit of voluntarism, and the United Way of Wichita and Sedgwick County has one of the higher levels of per-capita giving in the nation. Except for community health services, very little Wichita government local tax revenue has gone into social programs. Although some General Revenue-Sharing funds were once used for social programs, this has been discontinued. The human services administered by the city have been largely federally funded. Although the City Commission was favorable to "people programs" in the 1970's, a shift in the commission make-up, as well as perhaps the general mood of the community and the country, has changed this. The commission has several times in recent years enunciated the principle that social service needs should be met through the churches and other elements of the private
sector. The exception is the advancement of employment opportunity. The city government administered the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) program, and is now the administrative agency for the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) program in six counties. Although no city tax support goes to the program, the city government is strongly committed to the role of helping citizens become economically self-sufficient through employment. Its view is that other governmental and voluntary programs exist to meet other social needs, but that the power and position of city government makes it uniquely qualified to work in partnership with private industry to develop employability.

In terms of values, citizens of the community are cautious. The public has generally been supportive of bond issues for public facilities such as schools, a library, and a civic center. Progressive steps to eliminate racial barriers during the 1960's and 1970's appeared to have community support. On a number of major, well-publicized issues on which the public had the opportunity to vote in the last fifteen years, none has been approved. These include fluoridation of the water supply, a city sales tax, district representation for the city commission, and gay rights legislation. Public opposition to other measures, such as construction of a northwest inner-belt expressway, forced abandonment of plans. As this is written, it appears that citizen views will probably prevail over commercial interests in regard to development of the west bank of the Arkansas River that runs through the city.

For purposes here, a relevant element of the local government is the Metropolitan Area Planning commission of Wichita and Sedgwick County. It is staffed by the Planning Department of the city government, and its membership includes five members appointed by city commissioners and five appointed by county commissioners. Many of its decisions
represent contests between "neighborhood" interests and "development" interests, and the outcome frequently depends on the balance of power held by the commission membership.

Wichita has had a somewhat typical history with federally funding programs. Among programs initiated since 1965 by the Community Planning Council, the planning agency affiliated with the United Way until planning functions were absorbed by the Fund in 1976, were area-wide health planning (the Health Planning Council of South Central Kansas, now the Health System Agency of Southeast Kansas, the Community Coordinated Child Care (4-C) Program, a Regional Medical Program project, the local Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP), a special coalition planning project, and an Older Americans Act project on planning and development of services for the elderly. Programs initiated by the city government, sometimes with cooperation from the Community Planning Council, include Urban Renewal, the Community Action Program (CAP), the Model Cities Program, an Area Agency on Aging, a Local Housing Authority, General Revenue-Sharing, CETA, JTPA, and CDBG. Among federally-funded programs initiated by other auspices have been a Community Mental Health Centers program, Head Start, and a Foster-Grandparent Program.

All of the above programs have or had mandated citizen participation requirements. The requirements ranged from the hearings-only of General Revenue-Sharing to the very specific requirements regarding organizational structures for the Community Action Program, Model Cities, Head Start, and areawide health planning. As perspective for the Chapter V discussion of CDBG citizen participation, experience of five other programs, all of which involved the Wichita city government, is described here.
The first is the Urban Renewal Agency. It was a five-member agency appointed by the City Commission. First established in 1958, it was the first city government entity with housing and development responsibilities. Most of its members had some interest in property financing or development, but there were also members with demonstrated commitment to social welfare objectives. It conducted hearings, published notices of its projects, and conducted at least one neighborhood citizen survey of neighborhood needs and priorities. Neighborhood citizen advisory groups were organized in several residential rehabilitation project areas, but they were characterized by a low level of visibility and activity. As stated previously, the program focused heavily of downtown development. After 1973, the Agency had to compete locally for support from CDBG funding. The agency was abolished in 1981, and its functions were assumed by the City Department of Housing and Economic Development, working with an advisory board.

The second citizen participation is that of the CAP. The program was established originally in 1964 under the advisory direction of the Mayor's Committee on Economic Opportunity. It was a 12-member committee appointed by the City Commission, which was the governing body of the program. The committee members were chairpersons or staff heads of major community systems or institutions. In addition to the committee, there was a Mayor's Technical Panel on Economic Opportunity which provided professional information and coordinated initial program development.

In 1966, bowing to federal instructions, the City Commission reluctantly gave up administration of this program to a newly-formed private organization, the Wichita Area Community Action Program, Inc.
(WACAPI), the Board of which was made up of thirty members, one-third elected by low-income citizens in the program's six target areas, one-third appointed by elected public officials of the City Commission and the Wichita Board of Education, and one-third designated by specified private professional, business, and community service organizations.

Because of mismanagement, WACAPI was defunded in 1973, and its programs were transferred to other agencies. The basic CAP function was assumed by the city government, and the WACAPI Board became an advisory board. The City Commission was again the governing board, and the program was administered through the Community Action Agency (CAA), a division of a new Department of Community Development. In 1978 the Department of Community Development was dissolved as the result of controversy, generated at least partly by the CAP board, and the CAA was placed in the City Manager's office.

In 1981, the CAA was replaced by a Neighborhood Services Division in a new Human Resource Department, and the CAP board was replaced by a new Human Resources Board (HRB). This board was designed to meet citizen participation requirements of three programs—CAP, CETA, and CDBG. Since 1983, when CETA was replaced by JTPA, which placed control of job training and placement in a separate Private Industry Council, and a citizen participation structure was no longer required for CDBG, the HRB has been maintained to meet CAP (now Community Services Block Grant) requirements only.

The WACAPI board, the CAP board and the successor HRB have been involved in conflict with city government during much of their existence. Some members, especially representatives of the low-income, have expressed frustration over the steadily diminishing role of the board since 1973.
In addition, when the HRB was formed, citizen councils in each of the low-income target areas were eliminated, causing low-income representatives to feel that a broad low-income constituency had been lost. Although the turnover of membership and other factors are moderating the level of conflict and dissatisfaction, there are still confrontations. The role of the HRB is now largely that of reviewing and approving applications for funding, principally applications for Community Services Block Grant funds, and making recommendations for the allocation of CDBG funds.

The third citizen participation experience is that of Model Cities. The city government was an applicant in the initial round of Model Cities grants. The application was assembled by a team of three staff persons from the city government and the public school system, with some limited technical assistance from the Community Planning Council. Beyond this group, the only review prior to City Commission approval was by a hastily organized group of key agency representatives. The application was unsuccessful, and after dissatisfaction was expressed in the community over the process by which it was prepared, a meeting was arranged involving interested community leaders and a representative of HUD. The HUD representative reported that, indeed, the lack of community involvement was the key factor in the failure to be selected. Subsequently, a large task force including a cross-section of community interests was appointed by the city government to develop a new application. The group was accused by some black leaders of providing for too little control of the program by low-income and minority groups, but out of a process of negotiation and compromise an application was submitted that was successful in a second group of communities approved for first-year funding.

The Model Cities Governing Board was composed of 13 members elected
from the two Model Cities target areas. The program was managed by the City Demonstration Agency, an independent division in the City Manager's office. Although there were vigorous exchanges between the board and the city administration, the board is regarded as having been influential in the determination of Model Cities programs and allocations. The city government and the board sought to expand the program to a citywide level, but Wichita did not become a Planned Variations city. The board recommended the CDBG citizen participation structure that eventually emerged as the CPO.

The fourth participation experience was that of coalition planning. In 1970, with a special resources mobilization grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity, (OEO), the Community Planning Council fostered an experimental project to develop a combined thrust of eleven community systems, including city government, in the attack on poverty and the general enhancement of quality-of-life. The project was directed by the 40-member Coalition Planning Board, which was made up of representatives designated by the participating systems and by persons selected by them to represent the low-income population. Among a number of efforts carried out were a community goal-setting program and a 10-session seminar in which a group ranging from low-income persons to community leaders discussed with national experts the subject "Economic Security." The Coalition Planning project had strong support from its board, and it showed promise of enduring. However, some executives of the community systems became disturbed by the participation of their systems in actions over which they had little control. In addition, OEO altered the terms of the project by requiring that (1) the board be incorporated as an independent agency and (2) the low-income representatives be selected by low-income
organizations. By the end of the initial two-year grant, the Nixon administration had begun to dismantle OEO, and the project duration was too short for the effort to mature to the point of possibly continuing without federal assistance. Although the project became controversial and did not survive, it demonstrated that, at least under some tenuous circumstances, a range of divergent interests can be pulled together around a concern for poverty conditions. Further, the project may have contributed to visibility and awareness that for several years influenced the allocation of resources by such funding sources as the United Way, General Revenue-Sharing, and CDBG.

The last participation experience cited here is that of General Revenue-Sharing. The allocation of funds is accomplished in conjunction with the city government's regular budget-setting process, including hearings and published notices. For a number of years notices were sent to community agencies and organizations inviting proposals, but this was discontinued when the City Commission decided in the early 1980's to no longer support community services with the funds. While there never was a participation structure for making allocations, during the early years considerable public interest and activity was generated by the organization's competing for funds.

In addition to the federally-mandated participation programs, the city government has at various times created a number of other participation structures. Among them are a Board of Crime and Corrections, Citizen Grievance Advisory Board, Human Relations Commission, Human Resources Development Advisory Board, Commission on Youth, Commission on the Status of Women, Commission of the Status of Handicapped Persons, Civil Rights Commission, Equal Employment Opportunities Commission,
Citizen Rights and Services Board, and Child Day Care Advisory Committee. Some of these have been terminated or replaced, but several are currently operative.

The city government has taken a number of other initiatives to facilitate citizen responsiveness to citizens. They include a public agenda which permits any citizen to address the City Commission at a regular meeting, periodic "town hall" meetings at which the mayor meets with citizens at different locations throughout the city, the broadcasting of City Commission meetings on public television, and an information desk at the entrance to the city building. A City Grievance Office was discontinued in 1983 as an economy measure after 11 years of operation.

There are a number of voluntary community services participation programs in the community. Among them are the planning programs of the United Way, several citizens' associations in different areas of the city, and a "Community Task Force." The latter is a loosely organized group of community leaders and representatives of the predominately black northeast area who have met to alleviate tensions and improve conditions following several incidents threatening violence. The group came into being at the request of the City Commission in 1980.

The Study Method

The research for this paper was of a case study nature. Data was obtained through (1) participation and observation of the researcher in some aspects of the CPO program, (2) interviews with key citizens and officials, and (3) review of pertinent documents, including CPO minutes, HUD directives, various local reports and reference materials, and news articles. The period covered is from the beginning of CPO to the present time.
In general, the evidence utilized is of a qualitative nature. Some indicators related to theoretical dimensions were identified in advance, but evidence coming to attention was used as it appeared relevant. Although much of the analysis is rather subjective, and the research was not rigorously controlled, an effort is made to present the reasoning and conclusions clearly.

The CPO is described and analyzed in terms of three categories of dimensions. The categories are structure, process, and product. These are described more fully in Chapter V.

Data on structure was obtained largely through documents authorizing and implementing CPO. Data on process was obtained primarily through the interviews, participation and observation, and CPO Central and area council minutes. Data on product was obtained mainly from news accounts, minutes of the CPO, and interviews.

The review of CPO minutes was accomplished on a systematic random sampling basis. The minutes were reviewed for the first meetings of the Cultural Council and each area council in April and October of 1977, 1980, and 1983. In addition, the discussions of CDBG allocations in each of these years were reviewed.

The writer of this dissertation has resided in Wichita throughout the duration of the CPO and the participation programs that preceded it since 1958. He has been engaged in activity that has placed him in close proximity to CPO but not directly in its operation. He has known many of the CPO members and staff. Thus, he has had the opportunity to observe it closely, as well as to participate in original recommendations regarding its structure. This observation has equipped him with substantial familiarity with the program, and this has contributed to
significantly to the description and analysis.

The investigation was a relatively open-ended quest for evidence, but informal schedules were used where helpful. The persons interviewed were 15 chairpersons of CPO councils, the CPO Coordinator and three Administrative Aides who staff councils, five City Commissioners, and the Director of Planning. Meetings of all 15 CPO councils were attended.

Summary

This is a study of citizen participation in the context of New Federalism as exemplified by the CDBG program, which employs a block grant approach to revenue-sharing. The CDBG legislation, probably at least partly because of the carry-over impact of a program it replaced, Model Cities, placed a relatively strong emphasis on citizen participation, but it left to local communities considerable latitude in determining how the participation requirement would be met. In comparison to citizen participation in earlier programs, participation tended to become diffused to the total community population. This was a consequence of shifting funding from local special-purpose agencies to local general government. Most investigations and evaluations have determined that citizen participation has been influential in determination of CDBG allocations, which, compared to the funding of earlier programs, have tended to be spread broadly throughout the community.

This study focuses on the CDBG citizen participation mechanism in Wichita, Kansas. The city is fairly demographically "average" for its size and geographical area. It chose to go beyond minimum CDBG requirements in establishing a citizen participation mechanism, and the program is unique in some respects that are described in Chapter V. This mechanism has been observed over a period of eight years, and this study is the product of this observation, interviews, and review of documents.
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CHAPTER V
THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION:
AN INTERPRETIVE DESCRIPTION

Background

As described in Chapter IV, the city of Wichita had an extensive history of citizen participation experience by the time the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) legislation was enacted in August, 1974. The city government had only recently assumed responsibility for the Community Action Program (CAP), following the federal defunding of a private agency because of mismanagement. The apparent lack of adequate control by the private agency board, as well as the general local and rational disillusionment with confrontation strategies perceived as characteristic of community action programs, caused local officials to be cautious and deliberate in their consideration of further citizen participation provisions. The Model Cities Governing Board, although aggressive and frequently at odds with city officials, had been subject to sufficient management controls that its performance appeared to provide some reassurance.

The City Commission was interested in doing more than meet the minimum CDBG participation requirements. This was probably due to two factors. The first is the influence of Model Cities. The program had developed a constituency that was anxious to see its influence continue. Some persons had become sold on the ability of a participation structure to exert influence in behalf of residents affected by
programs and promote accountability on the part of administrators. Others were interested in preserving their personal roles of community involvement. The program was perceived by many as somewhat of an extension of Model Cities. The second factor is the make-up of the City Commission at the time. A majority of the commissioners were "people-oriented," with records of support for citizen involvement. While they may partly have been responding politically to a community mood that favored participation opportunities, they also saw the participation as a source of information that was beneficial in decision-making. The City Commission publicly invited suggestions for the CDBG participation mechanism.

Of the proposals submitted, the most sophisticated was that of the Model Cities Governing Board. It engaged a consultant who prepared a plan with a number of optional features. The options that generated the most discussion were (1) the number of local areas into which the community should be divided and (2) the relationship of the program's director to the city administration. The decisions on these issues are covered in descriptions of the program below. Briefly, the Citizen Participation Organization (CPO) emerged basically as 15 area councils served by city staff. It is worthy of note that the written report outlining the plan made specific mention of designing the program to minimize adversarial confrontation.¹

The CPO has been described as unique by local officials, and it has received some special attention in the literature.² The uniqueness claim lies in the fact that it was intended to become an institutionalized part of city government structure, providing citizen involvement in decision-making regarding a number of regular city government functions. Some of these functions were specified, but it was expected that
the range of considerations would not be limited to these. The structure was perceived as possibly meeting the participation requirements for several federal programs, but its existence was not so much linked to meeting requirements as it was to effecting a change in the way city government functioned.

Discussions in connection with adoption of the plan suggest that there was some thought that modifications in CAP requirements might make it possible for the CPO to fulfill the CAP participation requirement. One of the programs introduced by the city government with CDBG funding was that of neighborhood services. Six "neighborhood" center facilities were constructed with Model Cities and CDBG funds. In addition to branch libraries, recreational facilities, and health stations operated by various city departments, the facilities were intended to house city-administered social services and certain "mini-city-hall" functions. They were to provide a geographically decentralized system of public services offered by the city government, as well as perhaps some services of other community auspices. For several years, the CAP, the job teams of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) and a CDBG-funded program of social services had separate but parallel programs in the system of centers. The avowed hope of the City Commissioners in 1975 was to establish a single, integrated system each of community services and citizen participation. The combining of social services into a single system was eventually achieved, and the combining of citizen participation mechanisms was partially achieved when the Human Resources Board was formed to meet the combined participation requirements of the CAP, CETA, and city-wide CDBG participation. However, it was never possible to merge the CPO area councils with participation
structures for non-CDBG federally funded programs.

Although the CPO area councils have not been combined with other participation channels, an administrative structure was in effect from 1981 to 1983 that provided some linkage. Until 1981, the CPO administration was organizationally located in the City Manager's office. Then, in an administration effort to achieve integration of social services and participation programs, it became a division of the new Human Resources Department. CPO staff was assigned to provide staffing support for the Human Resources Board. In 1983, in a move that supporters said would increase efficiency, the CPO was placed with city civil rights and equal employment opportunity services in a new Division of Citizen Rights and Services, which reports to the City Manager's Office. In addition to the CPO, this division provides staff support for the Citizen Rights and Services Board, which replaced a Commission on Civil Rights and Equal Employment Opportunity.

The administration of the city's CDBG program is assigned to the Contracts Administration Division of the Department of Administration. That office is completely separate from CPO administration. The only connection between CPO and the overall CDBG program is that (1) CPO is supported with CDBG funds, and (2) CPO reviews applications for CDBG funds and makes recommendations to the City Commission regarding CDBG allocations. This underscores the broad participation function of the CPO, in contrast to a more specific role of involvement in relation to CDBG funding. Most discussions in the literature concerning CDBG citizen participation focus on the role played in planning and evaluating the CDBG-funded community program. The assumption appears to be that the CDBG program is a single, comprehensive, community development
thrust, and that the citizen participation component relates to the whole of this. The CPO is concerned with a broad range of city-government business, but most of this business is not associated with CDBG programming. Some of it does, however, relate to the achievement of CDBG statutory objectives.

The CPO is described by the ordinance creating it and by its by-laws. (See Appendices A and B). Briefly, it is an advisory system of 15 area councils, each serving a population of approximately 18,600. Each council consists of nine elected members. The councils meet twice each month. Some items of business are referred by the City Commission or a city department for consideration, but others are originated by council members or other citizens. Each council determines its own agenda. Most actions are in the form of recommendations or responses to the City Commission, the Planning Commission, or some other administrative unit of city government.

More specific information is provided in the discussion of conceptual dimensions in the three categories of structure, process, and process. The categories are defined as follows:

**Structure:** prescribed characteristics and conditions.

**Process:** unprescribed qualities that emerge and operate in the determination of the product output.

**Product:** results of the citizen participation effort.

The conceptual dimensions are variables that have been discussed in the literature. Some have been cited in earlier chapters, and others are considered here in the context of their relevance to this investigation. The discussion of the dimensions constitutes the remainder of this chapter.
Structure

Function. As the previous chapters have suggested, the question that has received more attention than any other in the study of citizen participation has been the function of participation programs. Chapter II identifies a number of ways in which function has been classified. For purposes here, function is viewed in terms of three types of "access structures" identified by Mogulof: advisory, control, and coalition. The three categories represent degrees of power that citizens have over decision-making.

During the years of the antipoverty programs, advisory structures were not considered as very effective. Stewart cited as problems that they experienced confusion about their task, and that members were not representatively selected. Steggart and Mogulof both noted the federal government's preference for advisory structures, but neither believed they made much impact. An exception, according to Mogulof, was Model Cities, where advisory bodies could block program development it disapproved. Terrell said advisory groups easily become captives of private interests, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development said advisory councils had been used to support city planning policy rather than provide citizens a voice. Yin, et al., agreed on the limitations, but said advisory committees had nonetheless had a beneficial impact.

Virtually all citizen participation under revenue-sharing programs has been advisory. While local governments could delegate to participation mechanisms the right to make decisions, such an approach has been rare. In general, advisory bodies have fared better in citizen participation assessments under revenue-sharing than they did earlier.
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CPO has been from its beginning clearly advisory. In the statement of purpose in its by-laws, one of the points is "To serve as an advisory agent to the City Commission." Other points mention "access," "input," "information," and "communication," but nowhere is there mention of power beyond advice-giving. Review of the actions indicates that, except for internal matters, such as selection of officers or determination of how it would proceed in a given matter, no CPO council has been delegated the authority to make a final decision or community policy.

It is not a purpose of this dissertation to measure the impact of the CPO on city policy decisions, but review of actions suggests that the CPO has had influence on decisions, the amount depending upon the nature of the issue and the extent to which it is open to citizen opinion. Concerns about advisory bodies becoming captive to special interests or being used by local government only to support and legitimate the policies of that government have not been characteristic of the CPO, although, as later discussion reveals some concern of council members that the city administrative and policymaking bodies exercise some undue control over what can be considered and what happens to actions taken.

Membership Selection. Considerable attention has been given in the literature to how citizen participants are selected and how representative they are. Methods of membership selection are election, appointment, ad hoc designation, and self-selection (volunteers). In general, election has received the most favorable reaction. An example is Bach, who reports, "Our observations indicate that the more effective citizen participation mechanisms are based on elected sub-area representation." Actual experiences in antipoverty programs, however, caused
some support of elections to be conditional. Peterson has suggested that election by constituent organizations may be preferable to general election by citizens, and Gilbert and Specht, among others, have expressed concern about the low level of participation in elections. Gilbert and Specht suggested in 1974 that there was a need for further research on the extent to which one form of selection would result in more accountable representation than another.

CPO members are elected at the city's general elections in odd-numbered years at which city commissioners are elected. Any person 18 years old or over may be a candidate in the council area in which he resides. Each council has nine members, making a total of 135 CPO members. Members are elected for four-year terms, with four or five members being elected to each council at each election. In some instances, there has been spirited competition and campaigning for council positions, and in others there have not been enough candidates to fill vacancies. Voting participation has been relatively high since the voting is accomplished at regular city elections.

It should be noted that the CPO election of participants is something different than most election processes discussed in the citizen participation literature. The election is open to all registered voters, rather than residents with qualifications specified by a particular program. It is an integral part of regular city government processes. Representation resulting from CPO elections is equal and identical throughout the city. A question in the original designing of the CPO, one which did not really become an issue, was whether there should be a system of weighting to enhance influence from low and moderate-income areas. The weighting could have been accomplished by making certain
council areas smaller in population than others, or by increasing the
number of representatives or weight of votes from such areas as the
Central Council, which is described just below.

Some writers say that social and demographic characteristics of
participants should be congruent with those of their constituency.
Except for geographical identity, there is nothing in the CPO election
process to assure congruency. Elections do not provide the same oppor­tunity for achieving congruency that appointment does, and the CPO
election process provides less assurance of congruency than the elections
in connection with antipoverty programs. Theoretically, the CPO elec­
tions result in selection of CPO members on the same basis that city
commissioners are elected. Voters select the persons they want to make
decisions for them, and they may or may not select persons like them.
While the inherent nature and purpose of citizen participation is to
produce greater responsiveness and closeness to the desires of citizens,
it is accomplished through a system of representation that usually does
not necessarily provide congruency. Most of the CPO members have been
persons who have been active in community activities, frequently in
leadership roles. Since their positions on specific issues are less
well publicized than those of other candidates for local office, even
though an effort is made to generate public interest in the candidates
and their views, such factors as name recognition may be even more in­
fluential in their selection than in the selection for other positions.
In actual fact, the limited number of candidates sometimes results in
members who are, in effect, self-selected. Comparisons have shown that
CPO members are, in terms of social characteristics, similar to their
constituencies.
Centralization/Decentralization. Earlier, reference was made to the fact that "decentralization" has often been used synonymously with "citizen participation." Here, it is used to refer to an optional quality of citizen participation. An individual program may be centralized or decentralized, or it may be a combination of the two. Yates defines decentralization at the local level as "the delegation of administrative and/or political power from the city government to neighborhood units." If influence is considered to be a degree of power, and the term "neighborhood" is broadly interpreted, this definition applies here. The important point is that the distinguishing quality is the location, rather than the degree, of the influence and power. Decentralization was discussed in Chapter III as a key objective of citizen participation. In it expanded upon here as it relates to the consideration of CPO.

The basic, usual governance of a city is centralized. A citizen participation program may be centralized, coinciding with the government it serves, or it may be decentralized, bringing pluralistic impacts to bear on decisions. Among forms of decentralization are neighborhood governments, neighborhood development corporations, neighborhood planning units, and neighborhood advisory committees or councils and neighborhood service organizations. In regard to the latter, a notable increase has been reported in the operation of regular city services by neighborhood groups.

The merits of decentralization are not clearly established. Smith cites evidence favoring both concentrated and dispersed power, and Schmandt has said that most literature on decentralization is normative and research is needed. Cook says that mandated citizen participation imposes "elitist models" on neighborhoods, and is therefore incompatible
with grass-roots decentralization.  

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), has highlighted in a handbook the significance of location in a discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of citywide structures and neighborhood committees. Briefly, advantages given for citywide structures are that they can assist local officials in setting priorities and in negotiating with neighborhoods, develop programs that can command greater local support, involve citizens in evaluation of CDBG programs, help overcome objections to location of low-income housing, and provide input on a number of issues other than CDBG. Advantages for neighborhood advisory committees are said to be that they can involve residents in identifying problems and establishing priorities and can disseminate program information to area residents.

Among arguments presented by others in support of decentralization are that it enhances efficiency in resource allocation, and promotes trust; it develops political skills; it causes decision-making to differentiate between various publics; it introduces more and different individuals into the political process than are involved in traditional electoral activity; it addresses the differences in needs between areas and groups; and it stimulates and facilitates feedback. Negative conclusions and views registered are that decentralization has not succeeded in achieving quality-of-life goals and doesn't justify the personal cost to participants; overall, it does not produce policies that favor the less powerful citizens; the neighborhood plays a relatively small part in people's lives; decentralization favors established community interests, thus constraining the development of underrepresented interests; and it might stand in the way of injecting
a "new vitality" into urban politics that could come from shifting the energy to citywide political activity.\textsuperscript{35}

The CPO was originally structured to address the advantages of both centralization and decentralization. In addition to the 15 area councils, there was a Central Council. Each area council selected one of its members to sit on the Central Council. While the Central Council members were expected to represent their area councils in the Central Council deliberations, the central body was an independent body whose actions stood separately from those of the area councils. The actions of the Central Council, as well as each of the area councils, were reported to the City Commission and/or other appropriate persons or entities.

In 1981, the Central Council was eliminated in a city government move to identify the new Human Resources Board as the single integrated citywide participation structure. A Coordinating Council, made up of the chairpersons of the area councils, was created to achieve some coordination between the area councils. Although the CPO administration was separated from the Human Resources Department in 1983, terminating the very limited formal connection between CPO and the Human Resources Board, the Coordinating Council has been maintained. This council meets on the call of its chairperson, usually about once each quarter. Several times a year there is an all-councils meeting to receive information on a subject of common interest and achieve some spirit of unity.

Thus, the CPO is decentralized in the sense that its influence comes from areas smaller than the city itself. Thus citizens represented by a given action have in common a geographical proximity of residence, and they share the concerns that are related to the geographical area. In addition, because the population of the city is
geographically differentiated by socioeconomic differences, they probably tend to share social and political ideology. But, as discussed below (see "Neighborhood/Area Coverage") the areas are not neighborhoods, and because of this, they do not have all the attributes, advantages, and disadvantages associated with decentralization to neighborhoods. The decentralization develops political skills among participants and it promotes differentiation between areas in meeting needs, but it does not create a broad based constituency, generate interest and trust, or facilitate neighborhood development in the way decentralization to neighborhood is expected to do. The decentralization to areas would not drain off energy that might otherwise go into developing a new vitality in urban politics—in fact, it probably has the opposite effect—but other concerns about decentralization would appear to apply equally to decentralization to neighborhood and areas.

Socio-Economic Representation. Reference has already been made in this dissertation to the fact that a number of mandated citizen participation programs serve only specified groups in the population. It would have been possible for the city to have met the CDBG requirements for general citizen involvement through citywide public hearings, limiting the participation organization to areas that would be particularly affected by CDBG projects or to the low- and moderate-income population. The city chose to have the CPO serve the whole population on an equal, undistinguishable basis.

The implication is that, overall, CPO influence will logically support decisions that are of greatest benefit to the majority, middle-class group. Because there are area councils, rather than a single citywide body, the voice of populations smaller than the total are heard,
but the weight of certain population groups is greater than that of others.

In 1978, when the city was required to submit a CDBG citizen participation plan in accordance with new regulations set forth by the administration of President Carter, the city submitted a description of the CPO. A CPO member complained to HUD that the CPO did not adequately provide for participation by low-income citizens. HUD investigated and agreed. The outcome was that the Community Action Program was added to the plan. Since then, both the CPO and the CAP (and its successor the Human Resources Board) have reviewed CDBG applications and made recommendations regarding CDBG allocations.

Relationship to Local Government: There are three general types of relationships between participation mechanisms and local governments. Two which are commonly referred to in the literature are autonomous, where the participation structure is an independent agency, and integrated, where the structure is a local government policy board or commission. A third possibility is a mixture of the first two, in which the structure is a local government board but is delegated authority to administer its program with substantial independence. The Wichita city government has structures of the third type, but only where there is delivery of services, in contrast to policy advice.

The CPO is of the integrated type. Although its councils have considerable latitude in determining their agendas and decisions, they have the same place in structure as other city government advisory boards. The CPO is subject to overall city policies pertaining to boards and commissions. It's administrative support is now a unit of the Citizen Rights and Services Division, which reports directly to the City Manager's
office.

Thus, identification of CPO with policy decisions, other than administration, is emphasized in documentary provisions such as these:

8.5 Relationship to the City Manager. The members of the Councils and the City Manager will observe the relationships and respective authorities and responsibilities of each. Specifically, the Neighborhood Councils and Central Council will act in an advisory capacity to the Board of City Commissioners on policy matters only and the City Manager shall advise the City Commission on administrative matters as required by appropriate statues and ordinances. . . 37

PROGRAM OPERATION AND ADMINISTRATION. The program's administration will be operated as a division of the City Manager's office, therefore subject to the administrative policies and procedures of the City of Wichita. 38

The significance is two-fold. First, the city government may take more responsibility for assuring the stability of the program and perhaps legitimizing its actions than it would otherwise. Second, the city government might impose some restraints on operations. The following responses to a survey suggest that some members see this as a problem:

CPO staff is competent, but the principle of planning, analysing and implementation by CPO "Areas" has not received adequate support from the City Manager and other City Departments. Wichita government can't make up its mind whether CPO is an "Appendix" of the great citizen participation movement of the 60's that should be allowed to wither, or a useful tool that should be expanded. . .

The only time I have a feeling that we don't get the whole story is when the staff has been instructed to do otherwise. 39

This view is not an uncommon one, especially among CPO members in the early history of the program. The majority of members accept the CPO structural arrangement as the logical and realistic one, and there is considerable satisfaction with it. There is a difference
between councils, with those of areas with high proportions of racial minorities and low-income residents being less satisfied than others.

Duration. Most federally mandated citizen participation programs have existed specifically to meet the participation needs of a certain categorical program, and they have endured only for the duration of the program. While no commitment has been made concerning CPO duration, its scope, which goes beyond the required function of providing involvement in relation to CDBG, suggests the belief that it might be a permanent part of city structure. This would be consistent with an ongoing intent to facilitate communication and reduce alienation of citizens from government.

Scope of Concern. As stated earlier, the CDBG participation requirement concerns participation in relation to the CDBG program. Although CDBG is described in a manner that suggests it was to be a broad community development strategy, HUD evaluation of citizen participation has focused on participation in development and recommendations of CDBG allocations.

In Wichita, CPO reviews and approves a statement of CDBG objectives and priorities which is developed by the Contract Administration Division. The only other CDBG function of CPO is review and recommendation of applications to be funded. Its function is stated as follows in various documents, including the ordinance creating it and the by-laws:

Responsibilities. Responsibilities of the Citizen Participation Organization with respect to advising the Board of City Commissioners as provided in the ordinance establishing the Organization may include, but are not limited to:

(a) Zoning
(b) Code enforcement programs
(c) Physical improvements involving special assessments
(d) Physical improvements involving relocation
(e) Location of area service programs such as aged, health, etc.
(f) Exception to rules and ordinances, when legal provision is made therefore, for such matters as tavern permits, signs, etc.
(g) The annual operating budget of the City
(h) The annual Capital Improvement Program
(i) Federal grants for the poor and disadvantaged
(j) Budgets for block grant programs such as General Revenue Sharing and Community Development
(k) Other matters as may from time to time be designated by the Board of City Commissioners.

It is not intended that all such items must be acted upon by the Citizen Participation Organization, but rather that the Citizen Participation Organization may initiate such recommendations as it may deem appropriate from time to time.

The significance is that the CPO was created to fulfill a purpose beyond that in the CDBG program. It responds to general concerns rather than a specific program.

Nature of Responsibility. Earlier chapters have identified citizen participation in at least three settings—program operation, planning, and policy influence. Not uncommonly, a citizen participation program has been involved simultaneously in more than one. Kahn has pointed out the disharmony of providing services and engaging in social action in the same setting. Literature was cited earlier to the effect that some citizen participation programs, especially CAP agencies, moved toward emphasis on provision of services as a matter of survival.

The CPO's purpose is clearly that of communication regarding and influence on decisions. The complete statement of purpose in the ordinance and by-laws is this:

Purpose: The purpose of the Citizen Participation Organization of the City of Wichita, Kansas, shall be to:

a. Provide for an equitable citizen participation system improving access to the governmental decision-making process for all citizens.
b. To strengthen citizen input in a comprehensive planning program for social and physical development.

c. To serve as an advisory agency to the City Commission.

d. To serve as a continuing source of information from citizens at a neighborhood level.

e. To serve as a channel of communications from the City Commission and the City Administration to citizens.

The CPO operates no direct services and is advisory to no purely administrative functions and practices of the city. A large part of its decisions pertain to land use and traffic matters, and many of its recommendations are directed to the Planning Commission regarding such matters. Thus, it has responsibilities in planning. While policy influence is also an intended role, relatively little of its deliberation is devoted to major policy issues. Consideration of the annual city budget and the capital improvement program have policy implications, but a large part of CPO attention goes to resolution of immediate situations.

The significance is that the nature and scope of responsibility indicate the expected impact.

**Size of Community.** As indicated in Chapter II, there is a relationship between the size of community and citizen participation provisions. Wichita is large enough to need a citizen participation program, but does not the sophisticated system that would be expected in a larger city.

**Neighborhood/Area Coverage.** Neighborhoods are much more than geographical areas, in that they are determined by social characteristics and relationship patterns. Most planners view a 3,000-to-5,000-person neighborhood as a basic planning unit, but size can vary.
The 18,000-person areas are much larger than neighborhoods, and several include within them wide differences, in land uses and populations. Because the boundaries were drawn on precinct lines, in order to utilize city elections, some natural neighborhoods were split between two areas.

Neighborhood boundaries weren't ignored, however, and they were utilized where it was possible to do so while also meeting the other conditions. An example is the north central neighborhood, where a citizen's group has led an effort to preserve the area and its historical properties. The neighborhood is in a single CPO area.

The determination to have only 15 areas (even smaller numbers were considered) was due to the cost and complexity of staffing more areas. Early in CPO history, the diversity within some councils caused members to discuss the possible desirability of designating subareas. A newspaper account says this:

While some of those questioned by The Beacon agree that the 15 area councils are not really "neighborhoods," they generally feel the areas should not be subdivided further. Boundary lines might be adjusted slightly in some cases where parts of an area feel they have more in common with another area.

"I think it would be a mistake to divide into smaller units," said Donovan Rutledge, of Area L and the Central Council.

"We have two distinct areas that define themselves as neighborhoods in Area L. I think we've been very successful in working with both."

Lakin said he thinks neighborhood plans should be developed for smaller areas, but doesn't think the formal structure should be changed.42

The prevailing sentiment was opposed to change, and although some boundaries were slightly changed in 1982 to keep up with population shifts, the areas have remained essentially the same as when they were originally established.
The CDBG allocation for CPO during the year which began July 1, 1984, is $150,000, $17,843 less than received in the previous year, and $28,780 less than requested. The CPO councils have requested that the funds be restored to the previous level, using CDBG contingency funds or general tax revenues, but if they aren't, as is likely, there will have to be curtailment in some form. The most likely possibility is a reduction in the number of areas, but a reduction in frequency of meetings is also being discussed.

The effect of the areas approach is to make CPO basically an extension of the city's electoral system. It extends a form of representation down closer to the people, but it doesn't develop natural systems or deal with needs in terms of natural "wholes" as much as would a neighborhood system.

Proportion of Minorities. Research has revealed an association between the proportion of minorities in the population represented and the participation impact. The per cent of minorities in the Wichita population is moderate, in comparison to other suburban areas, and the per cent among the persons represented would be doubled if the program were concentrated on the low- and moderate-income population. If the minority per cent were higher among those represented, the per cent of minorities in the membership of the participation structure would almost certainly be higher, too.

Based on evidence in the literature, the satisfaction of members is higher and the general level of impact is less than would be the case if the proportion of minorities were greater. When compared to participation components of programs that are more targeted on low-income populations, the CPO structure has had a diluting effect.
Type and Level of Staff. The availability and type of staff support has been found to be related to participation impact. In contrast to the emphasis on indigenous workers in some programs, the CPO gives consideration to professional preparation in the selection of staff. The specific type of preparation varies, however. The current staff includes, in terms of professional preparation, a social worker, a teacher, a business management major, and an urban affairs major. Quite a few of those who have been employed in the program have been graduates of an urban affairs program at Wichita State University. The staff is instructed to maintain a stance of neutrality on issues. As discussed earlier, all professionals express some value orientations in their practice, but social workers, for instance, have a more open, formal professional value commitment for alleviating poverty-related conditions than do urban affairs specialists. The citywide, total-population character of CPO makes it theoretically more compatible with an urban affairs orientation than a social work orientation, but the specific effect in CPO hasn't been determined.

The extent of staff support is a factor in the CPO's potential level of activity. The CPO is staffed by a Coordinator, who staffs three councils, and three Administrative Aides, who staff four councils apiece. With each council meeting twice a month, the procedural requirements of maintaining facilities arrangements, preparing agendas, scheduling technical assistance, writing minutes, and assembling information and materials requested by councils, consumes much of the staff time. There is little time for staff to become involved in the substance of issues, even if their roles permitted. Technical information regarding issue content is provided by other city departments or agencies in the community. The level of CPO action is substantially dependent upon the initiative of
council members, and this varies from one area council to another.

The CPO pattern of staff support assures the continuity of activity and emphasis on facilitating communication and information. It is not conducive to achievement of major substantive changes.

**Working Relationship With City Government.** Chapter III cited evidence to the effect that middle-range structures and strategies are most likely to produce participation effectiveness. One aspect of structure is the working relationship of the participation unit to the local government with which it is affiliated. More detail is presented here concerning this. The emphasis is on the working relationship, in contrast to the formal structural arrangement discussed above.

From study of the Model Cities program, Marshall Kaplan, Gans, and Kahn concluded that participation performance was determined more by the relationship between residents and city activities and planning officials than by specific product and structure requirements. Washnis concluded that institutional change could be achieved only with in-depth involvement of local general government. Warren, Rose, and Bergunder said that...

So long as disparity exists between the goals of the citizen participants and the officials, there remains the question of "meaningfulness" of the participation, the extent to which it is substantive, rather than merely administrative. Or, in even simpler terms, the extent to which it "makes a difference" in the organization's policies and behavior.

Citing a number of sources, Cole has concluded that the most successful programs will be those that "encourage maximum input both from citizens and city hall, but which maintain ultimate responsibility for direction and control with city officials." The dependence of the participant group upon the professional and technical resources of the
local government has been cited.\textsuperscript{48} The partnership stance with local government does require compromising of participant views. Ohlin identified a tendency of sponsoring organizations to minimize interests of citizen participants and maximize interests of the existing organization.\textsuperscript{49} Rosenbaum found that administrators speak of citizen participation in terms of their own priorities and functions, using such phrases as "enlarging public support," "mobilizing a constituency to implement the plan," and "improving the efficiency of information gathering."\textsuperscript{50} Uhlig found that in Model Cities, the priority ratings of administrators confirmed their role identification with their own organizational interests.\textsuperscript{51}

In specific reference to CDBG citizen participation, Nathan, et al., obtained data that indicates that "the attitude of local officials, and not so much the procedures set up for citizen participation, was the key factor in determining whether or not citizens' views were significantly reflected in the block grant application." This was interpreted to support the views of the framers of the legislation that the participation format not be prescribed.\textsuperscript{52}

In CPO, there is little working contact between participant organizations and the city administration. The chief contact is through appearance of city staff in their technical assistance roles. Their position is more informational than supportive of positions. Although there are variations between councils and individual council members, the general pattern is one of mutual respect between city staff and CPO councils. Because CPO councils make their decisions independently and the decisions are transmitted in writing to the decision-makers on other bodies, chiefly the Planning Commission and the City Commission,
there is limited interaction of a partnership nature. More extensive interaction occurs only in a limited number of instances in which councils or individual council members exercise the initiative to appear before the other bodies or to intervene with administrative and/or policymaking officials in some formal manner. In short, the working relationship is cooperative in nature, but the prescribed practice does not allow for much joint consideration of matters. The CPO councils are in control of their decisions, but the administrative and policymaking bodies to which they make recommendations are clearly in control of the disposition of those recommendations. There is little negotiating opportunity for the CPO. Most CPO goals are sufficiently modest that compromise is often possible, and few CPO concerns become matters of open conflict with city officials.

Process

Point of Citizen Involvement. An approach to the investigation of participation process, especially in the Model Cities program, has been determination of the points at which participation groups have become involved in the development of programs and funding applications. Cole states that the three functions that are most indicative of the extent to which citizens are accorded real influence are plan approval, budgetary review, and involvement in staffing. Here, the options used are (1) development of proposals, (2) review and comment, (3) approval in final form, and (4) evaluation.

In relation to the CDBG application and the other items specified in the CPO ordinance and by-laws, the CPO role is that of "review and comment." The comment responses often take the form of recommendations,
but CPO involvement seldom occurs at other stages. Some individual
councils have developed proposals for CDBG-funded projects, but most
projects come to consideration as proposals of other organizations in
the community. The CPO does not have final approval of any plans, and
it does not participate formally in the monitoring and evaluation of any
programs.

The CPO function is, however, as stated earlier, more broad than
concern for program and application development, CDBG or otherwise. An
estimated 60 per cent of the items considered by CPO councils come by
referral from other city government units, and these are usually requests
for review and comments or action. The other 40 per cent are matters
initiated by council members or city residents. These often result in
proposals for resolution of problems and concerns, but they seldom are
thoroughly developed plans for addressing major programs and policies.

The prescribed functions of CPO, as well as the limitations of
staff support, restrict the extent of CPO activity beyond reviews of
plans and the raising of issues. Nevertheless, it would be possible for
the CPO to intervene at more points than it does. Thus, the existing
pattern is a product of the dynamics resulting from the given circum-
stances.

**Staff/Citizen Roles.** Research of citizen participation, especially
Model Cities research, has included study of the relative roles assumed
by staff and citizen participants. Three categories used in one such
study were "parity," "staff dominance," and "citizen dominance."

In CPO, the staff is expected to be neutral on issues. Through
such powers as control of the extent to which information is available,
the staff can exercise some influence over CPO activities. The citizen
participants are dominant in making decisions, but overall the relationship can probably best be described as parity. This is of limited significance, however, in this participation model, where the role of the participants doesn't involve the depth of involvement that was true of Model Cities participants; the question of dominance is less of a consideration.

**Function.** Earlier chapters have covered the functions of citizen participation. For purposes here, the functions will include (1) power redistribution, (2) decision-making influence, (3) education, and (4) therapy.

Although the stated purpose of CPO is decision-making influence, probably the impact is in terms of education. Council members rate highly the information they obtain about city government and the opportunities they receive for developing political skills. There is also influence on decisions, but no real power redistribution. Arnstein describes the public information strategy as "clinical group therapy," directed at pathology. Except through this broad, somewhat elusive rationale, therapy is not a CPO function. There is no evidence that need for which the CPO was created was viewed by the developers of the program as illness.

**Strategy.** Earlier chapters discussed the strategies of citizen participation, which can be classified generally as those conflict and those of cooperation. Even in the relatively circumscribed CPO structure, there is the opportunity for CPO councils to differ openly and aggressively with the decision-makers. While the CPO style is sometimes marked by conflict, the overall strategy, as described above, is cooperation.
View of Participants. A number of investigators of citizen participation in programs of the antipoverty years noted that participants were often viewed as clients (persons given help) rather than constituents (persons from whom help and support is sought). "Facilitating participation" has been treated as a social service function, and grass-roots community organization has been identified as a therapeutic approach in mental health programs. The literature thus sanctions legitimate use of participation in helping clients.

The concern arises when the avowed purpose of participation is power or influence on decisions, and the participants are viewed as persons to be changed rather than as persons with something to give. The result of the "client" view is therapeutically-oriented participation, as described in "Function" above, rather than participation directed toward community decisions.

While there are differences among city officials with regard to the extent to which CPO participants are seriously considered constituents, there is little evidence of their being seen as clients. This is likely attributable to the fact that the participants are elected from the total city population.

Influence on Planning Approach. Frej and Specht have noted the incompatibility of two CDBG objectives, one of which calls for comprehensiveness in planning and development, and the other of which calls for citizen participation. Citizen participation generally fosters incrementation in planning, rather than comprehensiveness, but Blum describes a normative developmental approach that achieves both comprehensiveness and citizen participation, but is expensive.
The CPO influence on planning has been incrementalist. The CPO reviews plans, such as the Capital Improvements Plan and plans for parks and open spaces, that are comprehensive in nature, but the overall impact of CPO is in the direction of actions on an immediate, single-issue basis. The CDBG program only nominally addresses comprehensive community development, a situation that was one time challenged by the CAP, but has never seriously been expressed as a concern by the CPO.

Public Interest Concept. In earlier chapters, the relevance of public interest concepts to citizen participation was discussed. For purposes here, the concepts are, as cited in Chapter I, (1) the unitary, which holds that the public interest is the composite total of the views that all members of the public share in common, and (2) the pluralist, which assumes there is no single public interest, but rather are different publics with different interests.

The CPO embodies a pluralist conception of the public interest. The CPO members see themselves as representing citizens' interests in competition with, primarily, the interests of business developers and the city bureaucracy. While the target population and the strategy is different, the CPO members see their mission as adversarial.

Innovativeness. One of the goals identified for citizen participation in the literature of earlier programs is innovation. The belief was that broadening the number of persons involved in planning, thereby increasing the range of experiences and perspectives, would stimulate new ideas for dealing with needs and problems. Warren, Rose, and Bergunder identified degrees of innovativeness as gross (routine), primary (greatest), and secondary (moderate).
Because of a problem of all interested persons knowing when property is being considered for rezoning, the CPO promoted and obtained approval of a plan for placing signs on such property. There have been several instances of new approaches similar to this. On the whole, however, the CPO has, using the classification presented above, been characterized by gross innovativeness. Most recommendations have been choices from among conventional solutions. The CPO has been cautious about substantial changes or new, different ventures. Not uncommonly, ideas are presented by individuals that do not generate enough group interest to get serious consideration.

**Political Integration.** Political integration refers here to the extent to which citizen participation becomes an integral part of the local government political system. A high level of political integration suggests that the participation program has strong access to decision-makers and is viewed as a regular, influential layer in the public deliberations of community business.

The CPO appears to be characterized by a low level of political integration. While the CPO does influence some decisions, there is little evidence that the CPO is a strong deciding factor in major, controversial issues. The following are comments from a questionnaire completed in the spring, 1984, by CPO members for the CPO office:

- CPO still seems to be ignored on big issues where they may not agree with staff and the Commission. Our views are used mainly to endorse views already held and generally misused by City staff and the Commission.

- The CPO listens to the City Commission—but problems are not always addressed by the Commission in the manner in which we present them.

- CPO has no function if we are not allowed a respectable hearing by the City Commission. When just when does the City Commission ever acknowledge
us as having differing views? Why do they continue to make decisions without paying any attention to us? The answer is we are either very insignificant as an organization or they allowed CPO to come into being to present a "face" of being heard—to the community. If we are elected—then listen to us—we really represent the same people that elected the City Commission, but we the CPO are closer to the people. Therefore, we should be heard. We will know we have been heard when City Commission begins to respond in a favorable manner to some of our ideas.

I think the CPO listens to the City Commissioners but I think they should listen and take more interest in the CPO.

I have felt the decisions have been influenced more and more by the Commissioners personal interests and wishes rather than by the citizenry at large. CPO Council "O" to knowledge has never failed to respond to requests for input. As to their recommendations being seriously considered by the Commission, there is not much evidence.

The City Commission uses the Councils quite often as a lever for their purposes. In my opinion the City Commission does not heed the Councils' wishes and recommendations enough. I think the City Commission will have to cooperate more with the CPO for its input to be effective.

I have this feeling that the members of the City Commission do not really consider the recommendations made by the CPO—I am sure this conception is a commonly held one.

CPO does very good for what it is meant to do but it is hard to go against big business and money. City and county seem to hear the dollars better than the words of CPO.

While these comments are from only eight of the 98 members returning questionnaires, there were no favorable comments in relation to meaningful attention by the City Commission to the CPO. Interviews with council chairpersons produced more positive responses. While they are not sure of the impact of their recommendations on individual decisions by the Commission, they believe that the Commission looks to them in general for a reflection of citizen opinion, and that the Commission is more accountable because of CPO. In response to the question, "Has CPO been effective in influencing the Community Development
Block Grant Program or section of the program?" the responses were as follows with "1" indicating a strong "yes" and "5" indicating a strong "no."

1 - 19
2 - 25
3 - 28
4 - 7
5 - 7

There were more who responded favorably than who responded unfavorably, but the positive leaning was less strong than on all other items related to CPO effectiveness.

In the summer, 1984, one City Commissioner is opposed to continuation of CPO, believing that it serves no useful purpose. The Commissioners state their support of CPO, but not unequivocably. One Commissioner is consistently supportive, two others lean positively, and one is uncertain.

The perceived low esteem of the CPO as an entity by some members does not carry over to individual members. As stated earlier, the members tend to be persons who are active in community affairs, and some have been very politically effective as leaders in other organizations. A number of members have subsequently been elected to other public offices, most notably state legislative positions.

**Level of Participation.** Previous chapters have noted the low turnouts for elections and other evidences of apathy in citizen participation programs. The CPO is characterized by a moderate level of participation by both members and citizens. The average attendance rate of members is about 75 per cent, and in general, members are conscientious and enthusiastic about their responsibilities. There appears
to be considerable difference between councils, however. In some councils, members go substantially beyond their minimum responsibility of attending council meetings. The members of one council recently visited 400 homes to disseminate information and talk with citizens about a particularly important issue. In some councils there are individual members who spend considerable time researching matters for their councils, or appearing before the City Commission to promote a council viewpoint. Other councils are more likely to confine their activities to business meetings. The difference seems to depend upon the number and seriousness of issues, and upon the aggressiveness of certain members.

The attendance of area citizens at meetings depends upon matters to be considered. In a typical month, the citizen attendance ranged from none to 37. Attendance is high when there is a volatile issue to be discussed, such as a request for a zoning change to place a commercial establishment in the heart of a quiet residential neighborhood. Most citizens are aware of the CPO, but usually they get involved with it only when something comes up that affects them personally.

Coordination Emphasis. Chapter II cited attention that has been given to the effect of citizen participation on coordination of services. Generally, participation has a negative impact in relation to coordination.

CPO rarely is involved in social services, and it does not give much attention to coordination of projects or items with which it is concerned. CPO councils work together on matters of common concern, usually by one council contacting others for their support on some issue that affects more than one area. Thus the CPO achieves some
internal coordination and some common, integrated thrust, but most actions are independent from others, with little specific attention to being coordinative. In developing recommendations for CDBG allocations, however, one of the criteria frequently mentioned by members for selecting projects is that they not duplicate existing services. In short, coordination ranks high as a value to CPO members, but the CPO does not play a significant role in the achievement of coordination.

Staff Function. The role of staff has been shown to be significant in the behavior and impact of citizen participation structures. Among the possibilities are advocate, enabler, technician, and secretariat. The CPO staff group is designated the secretariat for the CPO councils. The staff members are instructed to be neutral on all issues. They arrange meetings, write minutes, schedule technical resources, and transmit reports of council decisions to the City Commission or elsewhere. They do not promote or assist council members in promoting their positions on policy questions.

The CPO members seem pleased with the staff arrangements and the staff persons. Some of the comments on the returns in the aforementioned questionnaire survey are as follows:

Our Aide carries a very good meeting. He is always well prepared. I think our CPO meetings are very effective.

I believe that our Aide is a hard worker whose efforts and competence help to create a very positive atmosphere for CPO-A.

I feel that our "present" Aide is very well qualified and responsive in all areas of his responsibilities.

The staff member of our Council has always been well prepared for the meetings, is very helpful to Council members and citizens present at the meetings; and when information that is requested is not immediately available, every effort is made to quickly obtain it.
No negative comments were made about staff service, and the ratings on specific questions were very favorable. Several council chairpersons interviewed voluntarily praised the staff.

Action Orientation. For purposes here, the action orientation of a citizen participation program is advocacy, coalition-building, or communication. Communication is stressed in the CPO's statement of purpose, and members refer to the achievements in terms of providing "a teaching tool," "middle-persons between citizens and government," "a liaison," "a buffer," "input to local government," and "grass-roots familiarity to local government." Many of their actions are along the lines of responses to requests for zoning changes, and these are transmitted as advice without any special follow-up support. However, members feel strongly about their perceived role as champion of citizens against certain institutional interests, and sometimes councils take strong advocacy positions, appearing before the City Commission or seeking media publicity to promote positions.

One of the somewhat latent functions of the CPO is coalition-building. Even where a CPO council does not take a position on a matter or does not take any steps to promote the position, the consideration provides information to citizens which enables them to pursue a resolution on their own. Groups and individuals with mutual concerns are brought together, and in some instance effective coalitions, usually informal, result. CPO councils can, but rarely do, become participants with other groups in coalitions. There have been instances of joining with neighborhood associations on specific matters.

As a part of city government, the CPO is prohibited by city policy from independently engaging in support of state or federal legislation.
The councils have the opportunity to review and suggest items for the city government's annual "legislative package" and make recommendations to the City Commission concerning it.

Planning Orientation. Planning is commonly classified into two categories of orientation—processual and task. The processual places emphasis on the process, with the product being whatever emerges from that process. The process includes the involvement of citizens, and their values and interests are important in determining the results. Task-oriented planning places emphasis on the technical aspects and on rationality. The product is determined by analysis of factual data, and the recommendations made to the decision-makers are determined largely by technical and professional personnel.

The CPO introduces a processual influence into what otherwise would be task-oriented planning. While the CPO councils have technical resources available to them and presentations are frequently made that provide important information for them to consider, the members lean heavily on values and interests in making recommendations. They identify with their constituencies, and in instances where there is a high degree of interest and agreement on the part of residents, they will support the residents' view. If there is sharp disagreement among residents, the members are more likely to be influenced by factual considerations.

As stated earlier, CPO members tend to see their role as guarding residents against business developers. Not infrequently, developers are critical of the CPO because of CPO opposition to development projects. A CPO staff study of CPO zoning recommendations for two CPO areas revealed that the CPO recommendations agreed with City Commission
recommendations in about two-thirds of the cases. This could be interpreted to indicate that this is the result of CPO influence on the Commission, but some believe it is evidence that the CPO is inclined to arrive at the same conclusions the Commission does on the basis of considering the merits of the situation. Other informal checks have shown that CPO recommendations favor the view of developers in about 65 percent of the cases. Sometimes developers withdraw requests for zoning changes when they become aware of public opposition as evidenced by the number of persons who appear at CPO meetings where the requests are considered.

When making recommendations with regard to CDBG allocations, a number of members say, they consider objective facts, such as the "track record" of the applicant in administering federally-funded projects. Still, there is little systematic consideration of options and establishment of priorities based on objective review. Most CPO decisions are based on the subjective perceptions and the values and interests of the members, and the CPO involvement in the planning process serves to identify and articulate these perceptions, values, and interests.

**Product**

The structure of CPO and the specific results of CPO actions embody, in a broader sense, support for theoretical social policy "ends." In other words, the product of the development of a citizen participation program includes the totality of the structure, the process it generates, and the actions resulting from the structure and process. The product can be viewed in terms of theoretical perspectives that make up social policies. The CPO product is discussed here in terms of six of these perspectives.
View of Poverty Embodied. Gilbert describes three commonly held theories of noneconomic causes and consequences of poverty. They are (1) material inadequacy, (2) individual deficiency, and (3) institutional malfunctioning. According to Gilbert,

From the viewpoint of material inadequacy, the individual's lack of resources is considered not only a characteristic of poverty, but also a factor that contributes to its perpetuation. The idea of individual deficiency is derived, in its most primitive form, from social Darwinism; here poverty is attributed to inherent person defects. A more modern and less invidious version of this theme focuses upon the culture of poverty; this idea suggests that the cultural and environmental milieu of poverty incapacitates the poor—not inherent biological factors. The third perspective concentrates upon institutional performance, the assumption being that social welfare institutions operate in such a way as to support and nurture poverty.60

Several citizen participation programs of the antipoverty period were ostensibly based on the theory that poverty is caused by social malfunctioning. They assumed that, given power, the poor could change institutional causes, thus eliminating poverty. Actually, there were few instances of this happening. Because of such developments as cooptation and turning to services emphases as a matter of survival, really significant efforts at changing institutions were few.

The answer to a material shortage explanation of poverty would be provision of vast amounts of income opportunities for assistance to the poor. There is little evidence that local citizen participation gave broad support to guaranteed income proposals or other approaches to accomplish this.

The view that was probably most reflected was the culture-of-poverty view. The idea was strong that if the poor could be changed in how they live and could experience different environments, they would
be freed from the trap of poverty. Citizen participation attention tended to focus this direction.

The CDBG legislation reflects a view of the cause of poverty. First, although it has been interpreted as primarily a physical development program, the requirements for serving the low and moderate-income suggest the underlying belief that physical deterioration is ultimately a function of the social and economic problems of people. The answer has been to encourage projects to improve conditions in low- and moderate-income neighborhoods. Second, an objective of CDBG legislation was to disperse lower-income families throughout the community. Both of these reflect a culture-of-poverty interpretation of poverty causation.

Because CPO has had limited identification with poverty needs and problems, it is difficult to classify it in terms of support for a given cause of poverty. Since it was established as the citizen participation program for CDBG, which is concerned with the lower-income population, it presumably was established with the idea that it would have some role in relation to conditions of the poor. Yet, as was noted earlier, the CAP was added as an element of the CDBG citizen participation plan in 1978, due to the fact that CPO was not considered by HUD to adequately provide for participation of the low-income.

The CPO was not structured in such a way as to promote significant redistribution of income and resources to the low-income. The equal representation for the total population indicates that. Similarly, the CPO was not structured to promote major institutional changes. This is evidenced by its stated functions and the extent to which it is an integrated part of the city governmental system. This suggests that it assumes and supports a personal deficiency explanation, perhaps with
emphasis on the culture-of-poverty variation.

This conclusion is supported by the activities and actions for its recommendations for CDBG allocations; it has tended to favor public services (human services) in greater proportion than other types of uses. Those services it has supported are those that ameliorate conditions associated with poverty or help citizens improve themselves, in contrast to services that might involve organizing of people or encourage self-help initiatives. The prevailing public interpretation is that poverty is a condition that exists because of qualities possessed either individually or collectively by the poor, and the CPO appears to be a manifestation of this interpretation. The exception is that some poverty is blamed on lack of job opportunities for the employable poor, but CPO has not significantly addressed this issue.

It should be noted that there are differences between CPO councils on this subject. The council whose area includes most of the black population (area K) is more supportive of institutional changes to advance interests of the poor, such as the election of City Commissioners by district, than other councils. In the overall impact of CPO, however, this is not a major factor.

Social Objectives Emphasis. Schneiderman has identified three objectives of social welfare programs. They are (1) system maintenance, (2) system control, and (3) system change. He summarizes them as follows:

(A) For the purpose of this discussion system maintenance as an objective is taken to include preservation and perpetration of existing societal norms and arrangements including those related to (1) definition and the meaning and purpose of life; (2) motivation for individual and group survival; (3) norms for age-sex role performance; (4) norms related to the production and distribution of goods and services; (5) norms of conflict resolution, etc. . .
(B) The objective of system control is to bring behavior which is out of conformity with, and seen as threatening to, existing societal norms, under effective control. . .

(C) The system change objective of the social welfare system is to promote change in the direction of increased system effectiveness for all members. The social welfare system attempts this by being an instrument for the removal of obstacles to (1) fuller and more equitable participation in decision-making; (2) fuller and more equitable distribution of resources; and (3) fuller and more equitable access to the system's opportunity structure.

The CDBG legislative objectives included objectives of system change, as well as objectives that can be associated with system maintenance and system control. The CDBG objectives include changes in basic social and economic processes, together with the underlying values and attitudes. Among the objectives are the curtailment of urban sprawl and the dispersion of the low-income population throughout the community. In Chapter III, evidence was reported to the effect that physical conditions are the product of the social and economic conditions of people, and that any lasting impact on physical conditions is dependent upon changes that alleviate economic deprivation. The means for alleviating the deprivation is redistribution of income and resources. Thus, the CDBG program, if it is to fulfill its mission, must require redistributional effects, which is a manifestation of system change.

The objective of the CPO is largely system maintenance. The limited power of the advisory structure assures that CPO actions in favor of social changes can be checked. The elected citywide representation assures that the CPO is unlikely to promote social change. The current system exists because it is a reflection of citizen values and preferences. In a structure that is designed to articulate views of the majority of citizens, the possibility of support for rapid social
change is remote. And, in fact, the CPO has not concerned itself much with matters involving changes in basic human and interrelationships or organizational arrangements. In matters that might represent some significant change, such as the district election of City Commissioners, the CPO influence has tended toward opposition. The changes recommended by CPO councils usually do not bear on fundamental values and societal structures. Rather, they concern immediate adjustments that will contribute to the stability and maintenance of the existing system. An example is a recommendation that a different type of traffic control be installed at a given intersection. The majority of CPO deliberations concerns zoning and building variance matters. One major consideration, which originated from other community sources but has been discussed by CPO councils, is the integration of city and county governments, with proposals ranging all the way from cooperative arrangements in some specific areas to complete merger. The CPO has supported the principle of cooperation and coordination, but it has opposed really substantial steps toward combining the governments. Appendix C, a list of major items considered by CPO in a recent year, illustrates the limited change orientation of CPO deliberations.

The best example of support for change is probably the introduction of the CPO as an advocate of "neighborhood preservation." While the CPO agrees with development interests in a majority of instances, it has not infrequently affected business development decisions to advantage of residents. Thus, there has been some shift of power, even though modest, from economic interests to a quality environment as residents perceive it. Some of this impact has served the lower-income,
whose lives are most often disrupted by the encroachment of business intervention.

**Nature of Goals.** A pattern variable in social relationships, according to Talcott Parsons, is universalism-particularism. Universalism refers to a general frame of reference, and particularism refers to "a particular reference scheme in which ego is . . . involved. Essentially the dilemma is whether cognitive or cathectic criteria should take precedence in defining the relationship." According to Warren, citizen participation, especially at the intensity of community control, challenges liberal ideology favoring universalism. Participation is usually associated with particularism. From a three-city study of participation, Peterson found that "those programs in which citizen interests were most accurately represented tended to adopt particularistic, short-run goals . . . rather than universalistic goals."

In the context of this discussion, the dichotomy is between a total community view on the one hand, and more narrow individual or group interests on the other.

Although the CDBG legislation appears in some respects to support particularistic interests, such as interests of neighborhoods, low-income, and handicapped, the general thrust is toward universalistic interests. This is indicated by the enhanced role given to local general government, and by the emphasis on comprehensiveness in development.

The majority of matters considered by CPO councils concern very specific conditions that primarily affect those living in the geographical area of the condition. For instance, zoning changes are chiefly of concern to those who see a change in the character of their immediate
environment. This is a reflection of particularistic orientation.

A traffic signal caused to be placed in a given location may benefit all the city's drivers, but if it is motivated by citizens of the immediate area for their own convenience and well-being, it is particularistic. The perception of most CPO members that they particularly represent the interests of residents in the larger arena of interests is particularistic.

The CPO does consider matters of general community impact, such as district vs. citywide selection of City Commissioners. The CPO support of citywide selection would appear to reflect a universalistic view. To the extent that it represents interest by members to do that which they genuinely believe to be in the best interests of the total community and all of its subparts, given the facts available, the view is universalistic. On the other hand, if the position is determined by other considerations, such as the threat that district election might pose for the continued existence of CPO, it is particularistic.

There is little evidence that particularism is a big factor in the relationship between councils. Councils appear to work together more than they oppose each other. The members tend to view their identifying a problem in their area as beneficial to the whole community. Councils more consistently support projects in their own area for CDBG funding than they do projects in other areas, but they consider this more of an endorsement of a project with which they have first-hand knowledge than they do a competitive bid for the limited resources available.

On the whole, the CPO is probably more particularistic than universalistic. If one accepts the idea expressed by a number of members
that they are working for a better community, perhaps CPO can best be described as representing a particularistic approach to the achievement of universalistic goals.

Resource Allocation Emphasis. Citizen participation has sometimes been examined from the standpoint of whether it directs the allocation of resources toward social services ("people programs"), especially services for lower-income citizens, or toward more traditional local government functions, such as public works. Until recently, CDBG legislation and administration emphasized the use of funds for the benefit of low- and moderate-income persons, but the program, as stated earlier, has always been seen as being one of physical rehabilitation and development. "Public services" were intended to be supported only to the extent that they were directly supportive of physical improvements.

In the early years of revenue-sharing, Wichita allocated well above the average of other cities for social services from both CDBG and General Revenue-Sharing grants. Then, around 1980, as reported in Chapter IV, the City Commission moved to a stance that says that local social services are a private sector responsibility. General Revenue-Sharing support of social services was discontinued and CDBG support was reduced. However, the city government has obtained a waiver each year since 1982 to exceed the 10 to 15 percent lid on expenditures for public services. In 1983, 18.6 per cent was allocated for public services, and in 1984 19.39 was allocated for this purpose.

The influence of CPO has consistently favored social services uses of CDBG funds. This is vividly illustrated by Appendix D, which identifies the councils supporting allocations for different applicant
programs in 1978. CPO has tended to be supportive of allocations for public services, neighborhood centers and services, and citizen participation, including both CPO and City Commission broadcasts and nonsupportive of allocations for public works and facilities, and parks, recreation, and open spaces. Housing rehabilitation and planning activities receive moderate support. The interest in funding public services appears to be due to the understanding of members that the program is to emphasize benefits for lower-income citizens, as well as the fact that a number of members are identified in some way with some of the programs seeking funds. Probably CPO has had some influence on the City Commission's decisions to continue support of certain services, although there is little evidence that the influence has been a substantial factor.

Aside from CDBG allocations, the CPO has provided little support for community services. Council chairpersons are divided on their opinions about the role of CPO in relation to social welfare concerns, but most councils devote very little attention to community services. Councils in lower-income areas show more interest in this subject than others. The limited focus on the subject appears to be associated with the fact that the city's business is perceived to be primarily that of fulfilling needs of a public works nature, and that the problems impacting the most people are such things as street conditions. Except possibly in relation to CDBG allocations, the CPO influence has concentrated more on support of physical changes than social services. Sometimes the physical changes have addressed social welfare objectives, however, such as an instance in which a CPO council joined with other forces to obtain a traffic light at a crossing where handicapped persons
cross regularly and a handicapped person had been killed.

**Types of Change Fostered.** In the antipoverty programs, the early objective was to open up opportunities for the poor by changing environmental conditions. In a society that had blamed the victims and sought to change them, the mandated citizen participation was widely understood to be a vehicle for building a constituency that could achieve changes in environmental circumstances. This objective was modified as time passed.

The CDBG legislation focused on environmental changes and said the changes were to primarily benefit the low- and moderate-income population. The law mentions the enhancement of employment opportunities.

The legislation can be interpreted to suggest that the program is to address problems of the poor through neighborhood improvements. On the whole, however, the legislation is directed toward general community environmental conditions, and there is little evidence that the expectations from it are as far-reaching as to include the idea that the environmental changes will substitute for changing people, and that social problems will be impacted by the changes.

The CPO has not, as discussed above, concerned itself much with fundamental changes. The changes with which it has been most concerned are environmental, but they have not been changes that address immediate human problems with which the changing of persons is associated. They have generally not, for instance, addressed policies or practices in the community that bear on poverty, family breakdown, various forms of discrimination, or aging. The social services endorsed for CDBG support are almost entirely services for meeting needs of individuals, rather than those that collectively focus on social and economic conditions contributing
Institutionalization of Citizen Participation. In general, the literature holds that citizen participation has become institutionalized. While the testimony around the enactment of the CDBG legislation appears to support citizen participation in government programs as an enduring value, the 1981 removal of most CDBG participation requirements makes it uncertain whether participation is favored by the federal government in connection with the program. Since participation is almost universally considered to be an essential element of community development, it should be a part of CDBG if it even remotely follows accepted community development principles. The fact that CPO support continues to be an allowable CDBG expenditure indicates at least passive federal acceptance of participation as a legitimate function in CDBG, but it does not appear that federally mandated citizen participation has become sufficiently institutionalized to withstand major political changes. The principle of citizen participation appears to be institutionalized, and, inasmuch as the reasons for its emergence continue to exist, it likely will persist over the long range, but program continuity has not yet been established.

The CPO was designed, more than most participation programs, to be an institutional part of local government. This is evidenced by its structural integration in the city government organization, and by its focus on general city government business rather than on a particular program. It was intended to complement the policy-making process of the City Commission, and it identified with business of an ongoing nature. Some believe it was expected to open up access to many citizens who couldn't attend the daytime meetings of the Commission but could voice the views at evening meetings of the CPO. It was to fulfill a need
beyond immediate requirements.

The CPO has not become institutionalized. It has persisted beyond the termination of the CDBG requirement, but its future is uncertain. Thus far, the city government has declined to budget local tax support for it, and the possibility is great that it will not survive if and when federal support terminates. It has no broad constituency, and, as indicated earlier, it has not become politically integrated. It appears to have a favorable image among citizens that are familiar with it, but it is not seen as a high-priority function of city government.

Summary

When the CDBG program was implemented in Wichita, the city government chose to meet the citizen participation requirement through what has been described as a relatively unique approach. The report of a 1980 study of participation in Wichita says, "The city has adopted at least one program that is especially innovative with respect to citizen participation (i.e., its system of elected neighborhood councils—CPO), and the . . . participatory . . . arrangements available. . . . means that the city is probably one of the more progressive and innovative in the country in this regard."65

The program is an integral part of city government, and it is advisory to the City Commission in a wide range of city business matters.

In this chapter, the CPO was described in terms of a number of conceptual dimensions that have been employed elsewhere in the study of citizen participation. The description reveals a sharp difference between CPO and earlier models which were the subject of most research.
Further, the description suggests that participation projects to meet CDBG requirements could depart from the intent of the CDBG legislation, and that the intent with regard to citizen participation was not theoretically consistent with the overall objectives of the legislation.

Chapter VI discusses the CPO description in the context of social work, the CDBG legislation, earlier participation models, and the two paradigms of participation. From this, some conclusions are drawn.
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CHAPTER VI
ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study has been to examine citizen participation in the context of changing patterns of federalism. This has been accomplished thus far by (1) describing a model of citizen participation, the Wichita Citizen Participation Organization (CPO), and its results in regard to (a) structure, (b) process, and (c) product. In this chapter, this information is used to review the degrees of CPO fulfillment of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) intent and objectives, and social work theory and goals, and to analyze the association between results and characteristics. In other words, the chapter addresses these questions, drawing on the previous chapters in regard to social work, CDBG, and CPO:

1. What are the intents and objectives of CDBG and social work with regard to citizen participation?

2. In what ways and to what extent do the CPO outcomes appear to fulfill or not fulfill these intents and objectives?

3. What CPO characteristics appear to be associated with the fulfillment of these intents and objectives.

In the course of the study, two discrete, different concepts of citizen participation emerged. It seemed to develop that CPO responded to an entirely different set of precipitating factors and purposes than the earlier citizen participation programs, which were the subject of
most previous research and writing. The two have been described as paradigms, and CPO is examined in this chapter in terms of the paradigms. The goal of this examination is to test the two-paradigm idea, and to place CPO, as an example of citizen participation in the New Federalism revenue-sharing, in the paradigm scheme.

Based on the analysis of CPO in relation to CDBG, social work, and the paradigms, the chapter discusses the policy implications. Briefly, the federal claim that revenue-sharing would result in greater responsiveness to citizen interests is considered, as well as the relevance to local planning.

Research implications are also discussed in the chapter. This will include consideration of relevance of earlier research to current participation programs, the potential for productive comparison of the CPO councils with each other, and the prospect for other participation models in revenue-sharing programs.

Finally, the major conclusions are stated. They respond to the purposes as stated above, and are followed by a summary of their application in social work practice.

The chief approach of analysis is Appendices F and G. Appendix F cites the position of each of the following in regard to each of the dimensions used in Chapter V, drawing upon information in previous chapters:

- CPO description
- CDBG intent and objectives regarding citizen participation
- Social work theory and goals regarding citizen participation
- Community development definition and description
- Democratic Ideology Paradigm description
Appendix G identifies how CPO compares with each of the other subjects just listed. It indicates whether CPO agrees, partially agrees, or disagrees with each of the other subjects in relation to each of the dimensions. The more significant comparisons are cited in the discussion which follows.

Community Development Block Grant Intent and Objectives

The CDBG program is described in Chapter IV. The discussion here refers to the CDBG requirements that existed when CDBG was initially implemented. Those were the requirements that provided the framework for the organization of CPO. In 1978, legislative amendments instigated by the Carter administration strengthened the requirements, but the impact of these amendments was still developing when in 1981 the Reagan administration eliminated most requirements. Parenthetically, the structure and behavior of the CPO did not change significantly as a result of these changes. This was accomplished, at least in part, by adding the Community Action Program as a part of the CDBG citizen participation mechanism.

The CDBG intent regarding participation is somewhat obscure, because of the wide latitude given local communities in determining the character of their programs. The testimony regarding participation provision in the CDBG legislation drew heavily on the experience of antipoverty programs, which supported strong neighborhood—local roles in designing programs, but the legislation and ensuing regulations seemed to envision a somewhat less intensive role of citizen participants.
The citizen participation compliance was evaluated a number of times until 1981, particularly during the early CDBG years, and most reports of results said that citizen input had been influential in determining CDBG allocations. However, the influence was not described, and there was little evidence of measures to strengthen participation where it was not influential. The attitude of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) was relatively passive, appearing to take the position that the extent and meaningfulness of participation was a subject for local determination. The law and regulations required that citizens have access to information about the CDBG funds available and an opportunity to react, and that the low- and moderate-income persons and residents directly affected particularly have an opportunity to be involved.

CPO appears to have been inconsistent with CDBG intent in almost as many ways as it was consistent. However, it agreed with apparent CDBG intent in some important respects, including the following:

- The *advisory* nature of its function, in contrast to control or coalition approaches.

- A *combination of centralization and decentralization*, in contrast to a wholly decentralized approach.

- The emphasis on involvement of the *population as a whole*, in contrast to a focus on the lower-income population.

- A *parity* role in the relationship between citizens and staff, in contrast to citizen dominance or staff dominance.

- A strategy of *cooperation* and communication, in contrast to conflict.

- A *pluralist* conception of the public interest, in contrast to an elitest conception.
- A relatively low level of political integration.
- A focus on environmental change, in contrast to focus on changing individuals.
- A low level of institutionalization.

There is one significant way in which CPO is partially consistent with CDBG intent:

- The nature of responsibility. CDBG appears to have anticipated a stronger role in planning than has been exhibited by CPO, but CPO and CDBG agree that emphasis should be on decision-making influence, rather than program operation.

Among ways in which CPO disagrees with CDBG intent are these:

- The CPO's selection of members by election. While CDBG did not rule out selection in this manner, it did not appear to encourage it, either. Given the strong role of general local government anticipated by CDBG, an appointed group would appear to have been more in keeping with CDBG orientation.

- The generalized scope of CPO concerns, in contrast to CDBG emphasis, more specifically on the CDBG-funded program. In the sense that the CPO was concerned with many aspects of city business other than CDBG programming, the CPO is concerned with a more broad range of issues than was stressed by CDBG. In another sense, however, the CPO subjects of consideration have been limited by the fact that the Wichita CDBG program has not been a "total", comprehensive community development thrust, as the CDBG intended.

- The area units of the CPO, in contrast to the "neighborhood" language in CDBG literature. To the extent that decentralization was envisioned to be through neighborhoods, especially those most affected
by CDBG programs, rather than through blanket coverage by areas.

- The incrementalist influence on planning by CPO, in contrast to the comprehensive planning specified in the legislation.

- The relatively low level of coordinative emphasis by CPO in contrast to the articulated commitment of CDBG to coordinated programming.

- The particularistic goals of CPO, in contrast to the universalistic emphasis promoted by CDBG.

- The CPO influence in favor of social services funding by CDBG, in contrast to the CDBG primary focus on physical conditions.

In summary, CPO implemented the CDBG intent with regard to an advisory role, a parity citizen/staff relationship, cooperative strategies, low-level political integration, and emphasis on change of environmental nature. Since CPO continued to make the Wichita CDBG program eligible for funding until 1978, the CPO obviously fell within limits of toleration for eligibility. (Since the participation requirement was met partially by the Community Action Agency beginning in 1978, CPO did not then have to fulfill all of the requirements). However, the CPO differed from the citizen participation options set forth in CDBG literature in the election of members, the scope of matters addressed, the decentralization by areas, rather than neighborhoods, the incrementalist influence on planning, and the particularistic goals. Although CDBG did not envision participation with any significant level of control, it assumed structures more similar to those of the antipoverty programs than is characterized by CPO.

There has been little deliberate, conscious effort by CPO to promote implementation of most CDBG objectives. An example is the
dispersion of lower socioeconomic groups throughout the community, which has been addressed only indirectly in the consideration of certain projects. Wichita city government has since the days of antipoverty programs taken the position that, in comparison to other cities, Wichita's population is already socioeconomically integrated. The tendency has been to try to operate programs on a citywide basis, rather than according to target areas. There is undoubtedly a reflection of this view in the way CPO is structured. Through the Housing Assistance Plan, the City Commission has endeavored to promote socioeconomic dispersal, but CPO has not had a significant role in developing or promoting implementation of the plan. In short, the CPO's tie to the CDBG program is relatively loose.

Neither CDBG or CPO gives much attention to the economic condition of residents. Except for short reference in the legislation to furthering employment and for giving special attention to the low- and moderate-income population, CDBG does not give attention to economic opportunities, and CPO councils do not give consideration to such matters, either. This is significant, if the view is valid that physical conditions are dependent on the social circumstances of residents, as discussed in Chapter III.

In terms of fulfillment of CDBG intent, the single most important feature of CPO is that it is structured to clearly maintain the decision-making authority in the elected governing body. The single most important feature of CPO associated with lack of fulfillment of CDBG intent is the generalized nature of CPO concerns and lack of intensity in relation to CDBG program development.
Social Work Theory and Goals

Social work perspectives regarding citizen participation are discussed in Chapter I. The profession has had difficulty in establishing its identity in relation to strategies for influencing social policy and achieving social and economic changes. Participatory democracy, redistribution of income and resources as a goal of participation, and the right of people to self-determination are basic social work values. The predominant social work position on specifics for expressing these in professional practice has shifted from time to time, and social workers are divided on the matter at any given time. From a strong action orientation that alienated many during the years of the antipoverty programs, the profession is now seeking a common ground that can unify it. The best prospect appears to be middle-range positions in relation to both the individual/environment dichotomy and the social action/citizen involvement dichotomy.

Community development is in a number of respects a middle-range approach to citizen participation. Because community development represents at least nominally the process of the CDBG program, and because community development has been established in the literature as consistent with, if not a part of, social work, it is discussed in Chapters I and IV. In Appendices F and G it is examined in terms of the comparison dimensions, along with the other subjects. The chart suggests a high correlation between social work and community development with regard to citizen participation character, as described by the selected dimensions in the chart. The community development view of citizen participation will not be elaborated upon here, but most of what is said about social work perspective also applies to the community development perspective.
Social work would ideally require of a citizen participation pro-
gram that it provide for really meaningful input, and that it be accom-
panied with the technical assistance necessary for participants to choose
from options on the basis of factual information. It would "reach out"
to assure that all persons affected by its decisions would have an oppor-
tunity to participate. It would be largely "bottom up," with citizens
originating designs and ideas, rather than usually reacting to proposals
conceived elsewhere. It would provide the opportunity to build a consti-
tuency and to exercise some measure of power in the arena of competitive
interests. It would be structured in such a way as to give equal weight
of influence to all segments of the population. It would permit consid-
eration of all issues that impinge on the well-being of the population
represented. It would provide for selection of participants in a manner
that would be democratic and would at the same time assure the inclusion
of articulate, committed spokespersons. It would be organized in such a
way as to take advantage of natural relationships and common interests.
It would engage in capacity-building, to strengthen its efforts and to
extend its influence into other influence systems.

In only a few instances of the variable dimensions does CPO agree
with social work goals. Principal among these are the following:

- Selection of memberships by election, rather than by appointment,
ex-officio designation, or self-selection.

- The view of participants as constituents, rather than clients.

- The emphasis on allocation of funds for social services, rather
  than for public works or other basic, traditional city functions.

Dimensions for which there is partial agreement between CPO and
social work goals are:
- The degree of centralization, where social work would favor a greater degree of decentralization than characterizes CPO.

- The scope of concern, where social work would favor a more broad range of issues, including those that go beyond those of local city government business.

- The nature of responsibility, where social work would favor stronger policy influence and more intensive involvement in planning than is afforded by CPO, as well as the possibility of some program operation, which is not permitted for CPO.

- The function, for which social work would include substantially greater power redistribution than is afforded by CPO.

- The strategy, for which social work would see a usefulness for a greater level of conflict than exists in CPO advocacy.

- The influence on the planning approach, for which social work would encourage a greater emphasis on comprehensiveness than does CPO.

- The goals, where social work would support a balance of universalism and particularism, in contrast to the strongly particularistic orientation of CPO.

The CPO differs with social work citizen participation goals in regard to quite a few of the dimensions, including these highlights:

- The advisory function of the CPO structure, in contrast to a coalition function that would be more consistent with social work.

- The population-as-a-whole focus of CPO, in contrast to target groups such as the low-income which social work would support.

- The organizational relationship of the CPO is an integrated part of the bureaucracy, in contrast to a more autonomous status that be more consistent with social work thinking.
- The *area* units of decentralization, in contrast to the neighborhoods that coincide more with social work theory.

- The CPO's "review and comment" role in CDBG programming, in contrast to social work belief in participation at the proposal development stage.

- The *gross* innovativeness of CPO, in contrast to the primary or secondary innovativeness that social work would prefer.

- The *low* level of CPO political integration, in contrast to a higher level that would be consistent with social work principles.

- The technician-secretariat staff role in CPO, instead of a stronger advocacy character that would be consistent with social work.

The disparity shown between CPO and social work does not mean that the structure and programs of CPO are inconsistent with social work philosophy and theory. Social work supports approaches for giving all citizens access to government, and to the extent that CPO accomplishes this, it responds to a social work value. But the social work literature on citizen participation views participation in the context of social welfare and CPO is not a social welfare program. CDBG is, in the view of social work, a social welfare program. A reasonable interpretation of CPO from the social work perspective is that citizen participation as exemplified by CPO is important, but that a program funded with federal social welfare dollars should be characterized as described here as meeting social work goals.

In summary, CPO embraces the social work stance for personal citizen access to government decision-making, and responsiveness of government to the public will. Accordingly, CPO fulfills social work goals through the election of CPO members and the view of them as political constituents. CPO does not, however, fulfill the goals of social
work in relation to citizen participation in a social welfare program. Social work would favor a system that focuses on the needs and problems of the low-income, that takes advantage of neighborhood ties and interests, that involves people in the emerging stages of program development, that addresses problems in a total and comprehensive way, and that is built on a constituency and has some political power.

The Two Paradigms

Chapter III describes two paradigms of citizen participation. The Democratic Ideology Paradigm is a complement to traditional democratic channels, designed to overcome barriers that have arisen to the effective functioning of the democratic political system at the local level. The Social Reform Paradigm is an approach to achieving some basic social, economic, and political changes through some shift of decision-making power. The chart in Appendix G indicates that CPO strongly conforms to the Democratic Ideology Paradigm as developed in Chapter III. The notable exceptions are CPO's low level of political integration; the extent to which it focuses on particularistic, rather than universalistic, goals; and the limited level of institutionalization it has achieved. By almost all other measures, CPO is consistent with the paradigm.

The Democratic Ideology Paradigm is citizen participation that emerged in response to barriers to citizen access to government due to centralization, bureaucratization, interest groups, and replacement of values with technological considerations. This study did not include a survey of public attitudes toward CPO, but based on the newspaper accounts, interviews conducted, and survey reports reviewed, it appears that CPO has been somewhat effective in addressing these causal conditions.
To the extent that it provides citizen input into decisions at the local level that were formerly made at the federal level, it contributes to decentralization on the national scale. To the extent that it facilitates input, communication, and interaction at the level of council areas, it fosters decentralization in the local community. Both the timing of the meetings (in the evening, in contrast to the daytime meetings of the City Commission and the Planning Commission) and the geographic locations of them provide accessibility that did not previously exist. Although the attendance of residents at meetings is not great on a regular basis, the turnout when an item of strong concern is scheduled suggests that many are aware of the meetings and think that actions of the councils have some impact on decisions. Through the use of the city's technical resources at meetings, citizens gain information that helps them understand how decisions are made and the rationale for them.

Because the CPO is advisory to the City Commission, views are conveyed directly, rather than through the bureaucracy. While some members believe, as indicated in Chapter V, that the city administration poses some restraints on the information provided to councils and the actions considered by them, the general view is that the councils are relatively free to pursue whatever they wish, and that their actions adequately reach the centers of decision-making.

In addition to the operation of the area councils, the CPO office is responsible for manning an information desk at City Hall, and for processing complaints by citizens. The two functions were added to CPO office responsibilities when the City Grievance Office was discontinued in 1983. This is another avenue for overcoming some of the impediments posed by bureaucratization.
The CPO has become an interest group on behalf of citizens. Citizen interests conveyed through the CPO are considered along with interests of other groups in decision-making.

Although council members are provided technical information for consideration in arriving at recommendations, the opportunity is afforded for them to express their values in their actions, too. Thus, the CPO responds to the reason for the emergence of citizen participation.

The CPO has done little in addressing basic social and economic problems, and it has not really shifted any power, especially to powerless elements of the community. CPO is not structured for these purposes. Thus, the reasons for emergence of citizen participation of the Social Reform Paradigm are not addressed by CPO. If these reasons can and are to be effectively dealt with locally, another entity is necessary.

**Policy Implications**

Chapter I identifies mandated citizen participation as a question of social policy, and Chapter III cites proposals that have been made for federal guidelines to be established regarding citizen participation in federal programs. The question here is, given a revenue-sharing approach, what provisions can best serve the need for citizen participation.

Because it placed community development policy-making in the general-purpose area of local government and therefore closer to the electorate, there were those who believed CDBG had the potential for restructuring government in the direction of greater responsiveness to citizen interests, and that the citizen participation channels would have increased importance as the articulators of these interests. The implications were thought to be substantial. This raises questions such
as these; Has the citizen interest and influence been increased? If so, the influence of what citizens? Toward what goals has the influence been directed? What in the character of the citizen participation has accounted for the results?

Wichita, it is doubtful that, overall, citizen interest and influence has been increased. In comparison with the earlier categorical programs, the formal participation program has been broadened to involve representation from the entire community. Because the function of the CPO is focused on the broad spectrum of city business, there is much less specific attention to the community development program. The kinds of things with which the CPO is primarily concerned are the things about which most citizens are concerned and want responsiveness from the city government. Generally speaking, they contribute to community development only insofar as they bring about incremental changes that, added together, affect development of the community. There have been some major decisions in which the CPO influence may have played a significant part, such as the cancellation of plans for the northwest inner-belt expressway. The CPO review of the annual city budget, the Capital Improvements Program, the Housing Assistance Plan, and other similar documents exerts some influence on city government decisions. Citizen influence on matters formerly within the purview of Urban Renewal Agency appears to be essentially unchanged, and influence on matters formerly addressed by the Model Cities Governing Board is less. The role of the CPO in determining the use of CDBG funds is significantly weaker than the role of the Model Cities Governing Board in determining the use of Model Cities funds.
The influence of the target populations formerly represented through participation structures of antipoverty programs is definitely diminished. The low-income target areas of these programs now fall roughly in about five of the CPO areas. However, the area boundaries are such that in some instances the target group population in a given area constitutes only part of the total population of the area. Thus, the target group influence is diluted in terms of council representation. The influence is very diluted in the pool of recommendations from all the councils. The councils in areas which serve the low-income target populations tend to concern themselves more with matters related to economic deprivations, such as employment discrimination, than do other councils. This is especially true in the case of Council K, which serves most of the predominately black section of the city. However, even with these councils, the business concentrates heavily on matters of regular city operations, such as zoning. The residents of low-income areas have in the CPO a vehicle for registering views about conditions in the areas, but the weight of their influence is the same as for residents of all other areas.

The CPO has more interaction with the city planning department and commission than did the citizen participation bodies of earlier programs, simply because the CPO is assigned responsibility for review of certain city planning items of business, such as zoning changes. However, the planning department provides technical assistance to the earlier participation bodies, and the overall impact of citizen participation on the functioning of the planning unit is not significantly different than earlier. The channeling of CPO council recommendations involves the commission in a way that was not done earlier, but there
is little evidence that the behavior and role of the planning entity has been significantly altered.

The city government has undergone some restructuring as the result of CDBG, most notably the elimination of the Model Cities Governing Board and administrative office, the City Demonstration Agency, and more recently, the termination of the Urban Renewal Agency and transfer of its functions to a general city department. The elected governing body, which had final approval of certain actions of the special purpose agencies, now has a somewhat enhanced role under CDBG. To the extent that citizens, through the CPO and other channels, have more direct access to the governing body than they did when special purpose bodies existed, there is potential for greater city government as responsiveness to citizen interests. The fact, however, is that responsiveness has not increased, at least with regard to the kinds of problems, issues, and programming that were the business of the special-purpose programs. The restructuring has changed the nature of the influence input, but has not increased it. The power of the city administration has increased, and, according to some, this has been at the expense of citizen influence. While the CPO helps to offset the closedness of bureaucratization, the overall effect of the restructuring has been to strengthen the administrative bureaucracy.

The claim for revenue-sharing is that it will bring decision-making closer to the people. Presumably this is considered to be the only variable affected in the shift from federal categorical programs. However, as noted earlier, cities are not smaller versions of the federal government. They are affected by competitive economic factors that don't affect federal decision-making. This appears to be a factor
in the Wichita situation. The structure of the CPO, providing for citywide representation and emphasis on traditional city functions, is consistent with this factor.

While the Wichita experience is not necessarily typical, it is illustrative of one possible outcome from the federal citizen participation policies of the CDBG program. The experience suggests that, given the latitude to do so, communities will probably choose to meet citizen participation requirements through an approach that will focus on citywide participation and customary city functions. If anything different is intended by legislation, the legislation must be sufficiently specific to say so. In the case of CDBG, where the objective is to change community conditions that are integrally related to the fundamental circumstances of the lower-income population, the objectives would be best served by citizen participation that would focus heavily on these circumstances. Such a choice can, of course, be made in the policy-making at the local level, but the traditional function of local government does not provide an incentive for this to happen.

The CPO fulfills a legitimate and important need. A case can be made that the kind of impacts that result from CPO influence contribute ultimately to changes in the economic and social circumstances of the low-income. The rationale would be that the changes resulting from CPO input will make the city more attractive for residents, and that this will generate economic development that will result in more opportunities and services for the low-income. This is a speculative argument, but, even without it, there is a need for a structure to respond to the concerns for which the Democratic Ideology Paradigm came into being.
There are two different purposes that the evidence indicates can't be fulfilled by a single model of citizen participation. If both purposes are to be fulfilled, two systems are necessary. The best chance for effectively addressing CDBG objectives is a program that is characterized by mid-point strategies and structural qualities. Community development process which conforms to the commonly accepted definition, with adjustments to fit urban settings, is a plausible possibility for achieving this.

**Research Implications**

Most of the research on citizen participation was conducted using antipoverty programs as subjects. This investigation did not parallel earlier research sufficiently to determine whether the findings of the earlier research is supported by findings here. In respect to some major points (the desirability of mid-point structures and strategies, the importance of strong involvement of the city administration, and the advantages of some form of decentralization) there appears to be agreement. However, the entire context is now different. There is a need for current research that addresses many of the same questions addressed earlier.

This study dealt largely with CPO as a single entity, covering the overall characteristics and impacts. However, the interviews and materials review revealed some pointed differences in the behavior and outputs of the CPO councils. Among a number of fruitful research possibilities is the relative impact of each council in the ultimate decisions made, and the characteristics that account for differences.
A major need is for a model of community development that fits the American urban community and a revenue-sharing approach. In Wichita, the CDBG program does not represent community development in the common use of the term. Compared with CPO, the role of citizen participation would be substantially different in community development of the usual sense. Community development has matured in rural and international settings, and it appears to have the qualities for enabling people to participate in renewing and improving their communities. Specific models are needed, however, that will provide citizens sufficiently strong involvement to be a substantial determinant in urban developmental processes, while at the same time retaining ultimate control by the elected governing body.

**Conclusions**

The main conclusions from the study are these:

- CDBG has not breathed new vitality into Wichita government or fostered restructuring of government in the direction of greater citizen involvement.

- Direct CPO influence on city policy is not substantial, but CPO plays an effective role in facilitating communication between citizens and government; in making government accountable; in enhancing the political sophistication of citizens, especially CPO members; in giving visibility to citizen concerns; in providing some counterbalance to other interests that are perceived by citizens as threatening to their quality of life; in providing a vehicle through which groups and persons with common concerns are able to get information and coalesce to seek resolution on their own; and in facilitating resolution of immediate specific problems that come to the attention of CPO members.
- CDBG is not a community development process in Wichita. It is not clear whether it is legislative intent that community development within the common understanding of the term take place.

- Citizen participation embodies two entirely different concepts. One (termed the Democratic Ideology Paradigm here) is designed to enhance basic democratic functions. The other (termed The Social Reform Paradigm here) is intended to bring about change in some fundamental conditions through some transfer of power. The CPO is a model of the Democratic Ideology Paradigm.

- If, as some prominent authorities say, resolution of urban physical problems is dependent upon the resolution of basic social and economic problems, citizen participation in Wichita is not a contributor to substantial physical improvement. CPO is concerned relatively little with social and economic conditions, except as protection of neighborhoods has some social connotations.

- The best chance for effective citizen participation in the accomplishment of social change is the employment of mid-range structures and strategies. Some adaptation of community development process is a possibility for achieving this. Models adapted to urban settings are needed.

- While both citizen participation paradigms cited above are consistent with social work theory and philosophy, social work construes CDBG as social welfare legislation, and thus it is reasonable to assume that social work would expect CDBG-funded citizen participation to focus on promoting changes in the opportunities and living conditions of the low-income. In this respect, CPO does not fulfill social work goals.
- The CPO is at least partially a reflection of the fact that cities are not smaller versions of the federal government. Cities serve functions for which a citywide population structure which addresses basic city purposes is the politically and economically best system.

- CPO has not become institutionalized. Established as an integral, ongoing part of city government, with only limited connections with CDBG, it was more directed toward institutionalization than most citizen participation programs are. While the factors that led to the emergence of citizen participation continue to exist, the life of citizen participation programs is still fragile.

- While the CPO's limited role in determination of CDBG allocations precludes a judgment about whether it encourages "spreading" of resources, as had been reported in other evaluations of CDBG, CPO has contributed to a spreading of attention to concerns throughout the whole community.

The revitalization of urban communities depends ultimately upon the residents, and effective vehicles for transforming the public will and wisdom into meaningful decisions are needed. CPO is a vehicle for accomplishing one important aspect of the task. Another model is also important to promote the social and economic and social changes that are essential to the complete fulfillment of social work and CDBG objectives.

The extent to which citizen participation exists and its results are of importance to social work in at least three ways. First, an effective program can be the vehicle through which clients of social agencies can participate in the political process. Second, a program
can either support or obstruct policies and decisions that are consistent with social work knowledge and values. Third, the existence of a program in a community affects the practice of community planning and development by social workers there, and in fact may be a setting for social work practice. For these reasons, knowledge and understanding of citizen participation is important to the social work profession and the social welfare field. Hopefully, this study will make a useful contribution to social work and those it serves.
APPENDIX A
BY-LAWS OF THE CPO

BY-LAWS OF THE
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION
OF THE CITY OF WICHITA, KANSAS

January 26, 1979

ARTICLE 1 - PURPOSE AND ORGANIZATION

1.1 Purpose. The purpose of the Citizen Participation Organization of the City of Wichita, Kansas, shall be to:

a. Provide for an equitable citizen participation system improving access to the governmental decision-making process for all citizens.

b. To strengthen citizen input in a comprehensive planning program for social and physical development.

c. To serve as an advisory agency to the City Commission.

d. To serve as a continuing source of information from citizens at a neighborhood level.

e. To serve as a channel of communications from the City Commission and the City Administration to citizens.

1.2 Organization. The general structure of the Citizen Participation Organization provides for fifteen 9-member Neighborhood Councils with members elected from neighborhoods designated by the Board of City Commissioners.

Each neighborhood shall contain approximately one-fifteenth of the population of the City and shall be designated by boundaries aligned with the boundaries of the election precincts of the City as designated by the Election Commissioners of Sedgwick County. The boundaries as designated by the City Commission at the meeting of January 23, 1979 are shown in Appendix I. Council area boundaries shall be reviewed and designated by the Board of City Commissioners not less frequently than once each ten years.

Each Neighborhood Council shall be represented at the Central Council by a delegate elected by the Neighborhood Council from among its membership.

1.3 Staff Organization. Staff for the Citizen Participation Organization shall consist of a Citizen Participation Secretariat under the supervision of a Citizen Participation Coordinator. The Citizen Participation Coordinator shall be appointed by the City Manager with the concurrence of the Central Council. Such other staff members as may be required to provide services to the Councils shall be hired by the Coordinator with the approval of the City Manager from persons referred by the City Personnel Office. The Citizen Participation Coordinator and all staff members of the Secretariat shall be City employees and shall be subject to all appropriate personnel policies and procedures of the City (salary, promotion, demotion, disciplinary action, termination, etc.).

ARTICLE 2 - NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS, ELECTIONS, VACANCIES

2.1 Initial Representation. Election of the initial membership of the Neighborhood Councils shall be in accordance with an interim election procedure determined by the Board of City Commissioners. At this election each Neighborhood Council area shall elect five persons for terms to expire April 3, 1979, and four persons for terms to expire April 15, 1977. Terms shall be determined by the number of votes received by each candidate.

2.2 Elections. Upon the expiration of the terms of the initial members of the Neighborhood Councils, successors shall be elected for a term of four years at the general City election on the first Tuesday in April of each odd numbered year. The first such election will be April 5, 1977, with succeeding elections each two years thereafter.
2.3 Candidates. Candidates for election from each Council area shall be 19 years of age or older as of the date of the election and shall be residents of the Council area in which they seek election. No person shall, during the time such person is a member of a Neighborhood Council, be an employee of the City of Wichita.

Citizens may file as candidates for election by presenting to the City Clerk or his authorized representative a petition signed by not less than 15 residents of the Council area in which election is sought, such signers shall be 19 years of age or older, or by payment of a filing fee of ten dollars ($10.00) to the City Clerk.

The City Clerk shall establish such filing places within the quadrants of the City as may be deemed necessary to facilitate filing by candidates for election to Neighborhood Councils.

The deadline for filing by candidates for the Neighborhood Councils shall be at 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday nine (9) weeks preceding the general City election.

A sample form of petition for a candidate for election is at Appendix 2 to these Bylaws.

2.4 Voting Procedures. Voting for election of members of Neighborhood Councils after the initial interim election shall be at the same time and in the same manner as the general City election. Voters will be required to be registered with the Election Commissioner of Sedgwick County.

2.5 Certification of Election. Following the election, the Election Commissioner of Sedgwick County shall certify to the City Clerk as to the number of votes received by each candidate for each Neighborhood Council. On the basis of this certification, the Board of City Commissioners shall declare as elected the persons receiving the highest number of votes in each Council area. The number to be declared elected shall be based on the number of expiring terms.

2.6 Oath of Office. Following the election and declaration of election by the Board of City Commissioners, newly elected or re-elected Council members shall subscribe to the following oath of office administered by the City Clerk or his duly authorized representative:

"I, , do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Kansas, and will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of a Council representative of the City of Wichita Citizen Participation Organization, so help me God."

2.7 Vacancies. In the event of a vacancy in the membership of a Neighborhood Council by reason of resignation, death, change of residence from the Council area, or by other reason, the Board of City Commissioners shall appoint a new member to fill the unexpired term unless the vacancy is declared prior to January 1 in any year of a general C?0 election. In such event, Article 2.8 shall apply. The City Commission may request the remaining members of the Neighborhood Council to present nominations for the vacancy. The appointed member shall serve only the unexpired term of the member whose position is being filled and shall subscribe to the oath of office provided in the foregoing paragraph. The oath of office shall be administered by the City Clerk or his designated representative. The appointed member of the Neighborhood Council may seek election to the Council at such time as his appointed term expires.

2.8 Election to Fill Unexpired Term. The person appointed shall fill the unexpired term until the next general C?0 election, at which time the remaining unexpired term shall be filled by election provided that such vacancy occurs prior to the first day of January in any year of a general C?0 election. If the vacancy occurs after the first day of January in any year of a general City election, the person appointed shall hold the position for the unexpired term. The four or five candidates, as appropriate, receiving the highest number of votes shall determine the election of the four year terms and the next highest number of votes shall determine those persons to fill the unexpired term or terms.

ARTICLE 3 - RECALL

3.1 Recall Petition. Citizens of the Neighborhood Council area may seek recall of an elected or appointed Neighborhood Council member by presenting to the Citizen Participation Secretariat a petition signed by not less than twenty-five (25) percent of the total number of legally qualified voters within the C?0 area from which the Neighborhood Council member was elected and who voted for that position in the last Council election. Petitioners shall certify by their signature that they voted in the last Council election.

The Secretariat shall within fifteen (15) days from the date of filing of the recall petition verify the addresses of the signers as being residents of the Neighborhood Council area and the content and validity of the petition and present the petition to the Board of City Commissioners.
The Board of City Commissioners shall determine from the petition and from such investigations as it deems appropriate whether there are sufficient grounds for removal. If the Board of City Commissioners determines that grounds for removal exist, it shall declare a vacancy to exist on the Neighborhood Council and shall notify the person removed of its action. If the Board of City Commissioners determines that sufficient grounds for removal do not exist, it shall strike the matter from its agenda.

Any vacancy resulting from a petition for recall shall be filled in the same manner as for other vacancies on the Neighborhood Council.

3.2 Recall Petition - Content. The petition for recall shall:

(a) Contain a general statement of the grounds for which removal is sought, not to exceed 200 words;
(b) Certify that the signers voted in the last preceding election for the Neighborhood Council area concerned;
(c) Require that all signatures be valid signatures of residents of the Neighborhood Council area concerned;
(d) Not require the signatures to the petition all to be appended to one paper, but each signer shall add to their signature their place of residence by street and number. One of the signatures of each paper shall be taken before an officer competent to administer oaths that the statements therein made are true as such person believes, and that each signature to the paper is the genuine signature of the person whose name it purports to be;
(e) Have a date affixed stating the exact date said petition was first instituted;
(f) Be valid only if it is presented to the Secretary within sixty (60) days from the date set out in subsection (a) of this paragraph;
(g) May be presented to the City Attorney prior to its circulation for signatures and, if approved as to form, shall thereafter be free from challenge except as to the validity of signatures or matters concerning fraud or forgery.

ARTICLE 4 - NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCILS, OFFICERS

4.1 Officers. Election. At the second regular meeting following the first Tuesday in April each year, each Neighborhood Council shall elect one of its members as Chairperson, one of its members as First Vice Chairperson, one of its members as Second Vice Chairperson, and one of its members as Delegate to the Central Council. The Chairperson or a Vice Chairperson may be designated as the Delegate to the Central Council. Officers shall be selected by majority written ballot of the Council membership. Officers may be reselected to successive terms.

4.2 Officers. Duties.

(a) Chairperson. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Neighborhood Council; shall appoint such special committees as may be deemed necessary with the concurrence of the Council; and shall sign all documents approved by the Council.
(b) First Vice Chairperson. The First Vice Chairperson shall carry out the duties of the Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.
(c) Second Vice Chairperson. The Second Vice Chairperson shall carry out the duties of the Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson and First Vice Chairperson.

4.3 Central Council Delegate. Duties. The Neighborhood Council Delegate to the Central Council shall represent the Neighborhood Council in meetings of the Central Council and may also be elected to serve as an officer of the Central Council. The Delegate may be recalled by majority, written vote of the Neighborhood Council.

In the event the elected Delegate to the Central Council is unable to attend a meeting of the Central Council, the Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson or a member of the Neighborhood Council shall participate in the Central Council meeting with all the rights and privileges of the regular Delegate; provided, that if the Delegate is an officer of the Central Council the alternate shall not serve in the capacity of that office.

ARTICLE 3 - CENTRAL COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP, OFFICER, DUTIES

3.1 Membership. Membership of the Central Council shall consist of the elected Delegates
3.2 Officers. As the second regular meeting of the Central Council in April of each year, the Central Council shall elect from among its membership a Chairperson, a First Vice Chairperson, and a Second Vice Chairperson. Terms of officers shall be for one year or until such time as a successor has been elected.

3.3 Duties of Officers.

(a) Chairperson. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Central Council; shall appoint such special committees as may be deemed necessary with the concurrence of the Council; and shall sign all documents approved by the Council.

(b) First Vice Chairperson. The First Vice Chairperson shall carry out the duties of the Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson.

(c) Second Vice Chairperson. The Second Vice Chairperson shall carry out the duties of the Chairperson in the absence of the Chairperson and the First Vice Chairperson.

ARTICLE 6 - COMPENSATION AND EXPENSES

6.1 Compensation. Members of the Citizen Participation Councils will serve as a public service to the community without financial compensation.

6.2 Bus Transportation Costs. Members of the Neighborhood Councils and Central Council shall be eligible for reimbursement of necessary bus transportation costs for participation in Council activities in accordance with the published City of Wichita Policy for appointive boards and commissions.

6.3 Parking Permits. Parking permits for use in the Municipal Parking Garage while participating in official business of the CPO at City Hall will be provided in accordance with current City of Wichita Administrative Regulation.

ARTICLE 7 - SECRETARIAT

7.1 Secretariat Authorized, Staffing. The City of Wichita shall provide administrative services to the Central Council and Neighborhood Councils through a Citizen Participation Secretariat. The Secretariat shall consist of a Citizen Participation Coordinator appointed by the City Manager with the concurrence of the Central Council and such other staff members as may be deemed necessary to provide services to the Councils.

Such other staff members as may be required will be hired by the Citizen Participation Coordinator with the approval of the City Manager from persons referred by the City Personnel Office. The Citizen Participation Coordinator and all staff members of the Secretariat shall be City employees and shall be subject to all appropriate personnel policies and procedures of the City (salary, promotion, demotion, disciplinary action, termination, etc.).

7.2 Secretariat Responsibilities. The Coordinator shall assure that the following activities are done: written agendas for each meeting of the Central Council and Neighborhood Councils; execution of calls for special meetings; coordination of appearances of City staff representatives as requested by the Councils; recording of minutes of the meetings of the Councils; liaison with the City Manager; preparation of quarterly reports on CPO budget expenditures; and such other duties as may be mutually determined by the Central Council and the City Manager. Copies of all minutes of Council meetings shall be provided to the Board of City Commissioners.

7.3 Legal Services. Requests for legal services shall be in writing and directed to the City Attorney. Upon a request being made concerning parliamentary rulings, interpretations of bylaws, City rules or ordinances or other municipal affairs, the legal opinion of the City Attorney shall be considered final except as it may be adjudicated in the courts.

ARTICLE 8 - COUNCIL FUNCTIONS, DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

8.1 Functions and Duties. The functions and duties of the Councils of the Citizen Participation Organization shall be as outlined in Paragraph 1.1 of these Bylaws.

8.2 Responsibilities. Responsibilities of the Citizen Participation Organization with respect to advising the Board of City Commissioners as provided in the ordinance establishing the
Organization may include, but are not limited to:

(a) Zoning
(b) Code enforcement programs
(c) Physical improvements involving special assessments
(d) Physical improvements involving relocation
(e) Location of area service programs such as aged, health, etc.
(f) Exception to rules and ordinances, when legal provision is made therefor, for such matters as tavern permits, signs, etc.
(g) The annual operating budget of the City
(h) The annual Capital Improvement Program
(i) Federal grants for the poor and disadvantaged
(j) Budgets for block grant programs such as General Revenue Sharing and Community Development
(k) Other matters as may from time to time be designated by the Board of City Commissioners.

It is not intended that all such items must be acted upon by the Citizen Participation Organization, but rather that the Citizen Participation Organization may initiate such recommendations as it may deem appropriate from time to time.

8.3 Responsibilities to Citizens. Each Council member is responsible to serve as a representative of the citizens of his or her Council area in presenting concerns relating to municipal policy. In turn, the Council member is also expected to serve as a channel of information to citizens of the neighborhood regarding policy actions of the Board of City Commissioners and information from the City Administration.

8.4 Responsibilities to the Board of City Commissioners. With respect to the matters listed in Paragraph 3.3, each Council member is expected to participate in formulation of Council recommendations relating to matters of policy to be considered by the Board of City Commissioners.

The Councils have the responsibility to advise and recommend to the City Commission on matters within the legislative powers of the Board of City Commissioners.

8.5 Relationship to the City Manager. The members of the Councils and the City Manager will observe the relationships and respective authorities and responsibilities of each. Specifically, the Neighborhood Councils and Central Council will act in an advisory capacity to the Board of City Commissioners on policy matters only and the City Manager shall advise the City Commission on administrative matters as required by appropriate statutes and ordinances.

No members of any Citizen Participation Council shall interfere or provide recommendations to the City Commission on the conduct of any employee or on personal procedures as they affect a City employee. Such items are to be considered administrative matters outside the purview of the Councils and are to be excluded from general discussion.

The City Manager shall, through the Citizen Participation Secretariat, provide such materials and information to the Citizen Participation Councils as will enable them to fulfill their advisory responsibilities to the Board of City Commissioners. The City Manager shall assist in making available to the Councils such resource persons from the City staff as may be necessary to assist the Councils in their deliberations.

ARTICLE 9 - REGULAR MEETINGS

9.1 Frequency of Meetings. Two meetings will be held each month by the Neighborhood Councils, and the Central Council unless otherwise agreed upon with approval of the Council and the Coordinator.

9.2 Time and Place of Meetings.

(a) The Neighborhood Councils shall meet at the time and place as agreed to by the Secretariat and the various Councils.
(b) The Central Council shall meet in the public meeting room, City Hall, 455 North Main, at the time agreed to by the Secretariat and the Council. There will be a minimum of one hour set aside at every second meeting of the Central Council to meet with the Board of City Commissioners.
(c) The time and places of the Central Council meeting and each Neighborhood Council meeting shall be made easily available to the general public.

9.3 Executive Sessions. All regular and special meetings of the Citizen Participation Councils shall be open to the public and the press. The Councils may meet in executive
session, closed to the public and press, for the purpose of discussing personal matters, acquisitions of land or property, and matters concerning litigation or threatened litigation, or matters pertaining to the location or establishment of any industries. Any final action shall be taken in public meeting. Executive sessions shall be held at such time and place as may be announced by the presiding officer subject to approval of a majority of the Council members.

9.4 Quorum. A quorum of a Neighborhood Council shall be a majority of members of the Council. A quorum of the Central Council shall be a majority of members.

ARTICLE 10 – SPECIAL MEETINGS

10.1 Call for Special Meeting. Any five members of a Neighborhood Council, any eight members of the Central Council, or the Secretariat with the concurrence of the appropriate Council Chairperson may call a special Council meeting. The purpose of such a meeting must be stated to the Council in writing. The purpose of the call and the action of the Council shall be entered in the minutes of the special meeting and no other business may be transacted except as stated in the call for the meeting. The Secretariat shall be notified of and be present at all special meetings.

10.2 Written Notice of Special Meeting. A written notice of a special meeting stating the time, place and purpose shall be delivered by mail or personal delivery to the residence of each member of the appropriate Council at least twenty-four (24) hours before the time of the special meeting. Notices shall be distributed to the members by the Secretariat.

10.3 Order of Business for Special Meeting. The order of business at special meetings shall be as follows:

(a) Call to order
(b) Invocation (optional)
(c) Roll Call
(d) Reading of the call for the meeting by the Secretariat
(e) Consideration of the business contained in the call
(f) Adjournment.

ARTICLE 11 – CONDUCT OF MEETINGS

11.1 Order of Business. Regular meetings of the Neighborhood Councils and the Central Council shall be conducted by Roberts Rules of Order, Newly Revised, except as modified herein. The order of business shall be set by mutual agreement of the Secretariat and the Neighborhood Councils and the Central Council. A suggested order of business is as follows:

(a) Call to Order. Promptly at the hour appointed for the meeting the presiding officer shall take the chair and shall call the Council to order.
(b) Invocation (Optional). The presiding officer shall announce the invocation and appoint an individual to give the invocation.
(c) Attendance. A member of the Secretariat shall take the attendance and enter as a matter of record the presence or absence of all members during all or any part of the meeting.
(d) Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting. Minutes of the previous meeting shall be approved, corrected or amended and, if approved by a majority of the quorum present, shall be entered into the permanent record. Minutes of the previous meeting shall not be read aloud in their entirety unless so requested by a majority vote of the quorum present.
(e) Agenda. The Chairperson shall call for additions to, deletions from, or changes in the adopted order of business and having announced the revisions (if any) the revised order shall be strictly adhered to.
(f) Reports and Correspondence.
(g) Public Agenda. This portion of the meeting shall be limited to a period of thirty minutes and subject to a limitation of five minutes for each presentation unless extended by a vote of a majority of the membership.

Members of the public desiring to present matters to a Council on the public
agenda must submit a request in writing to the office of the Secretary prior to 12 o'clock upon five full days prior to the day of the Council meeting. The request should state the name of the individual desiring to be heard and the matter to be presented. Matters pertaining to administrative matters, litigation, and violations of laws or ordinances are excluded from the agenda. Rules of decorum as provided in these bylaws shall be observed.

(b) Secretary's Agenda. Items on the Secretary's agenda shall be presented by a member of the Secretary or a person designated by the Secretary. The order of presentation shall follow the agenda except as may be directed otherwise by the presiding officer and each item shall be concluded before the next item is discussed. Except for questions from members for purposes of clarification, the Secretary shall be permitted to explain fully each individual item before detailed questions or discussion is had either by the members or by the public members present.

Following the complete presentation of each item on the agenda and the specific recommendations of the Secretary or his designee, the matter shall be open for discussion from the floor by public members. Public comments and comments from the Secretary shall be allowed on all motions; provided, however, that any member may at any time move to close the public debate and, if seconded, all public comments shall cease and the membership shall vote on said motion which, if passed, shall close the public debate.

Discussion and debate of the original motion may be continued between members until the Chairperson or any members calls for the question. A call for the question, if seconded, shall immediately end all debate and discussion and if said vote carries, the original motion must be voted on without delay.

After the formal vote has been taken, all further discussion of the matter shall cease.

The Secretary will assure that all items under this portion of the agenda have a narrative explanation of the item under consideration with the accompanying recommendation of the Secretary included on the agenda.

(1) Presentation of the Council Agenda. Items on the Council Agenda shall be presented by the member(s) sponsoring such items.

Generally, the order of presentation shall follow the agenda except as may be directed otherwise by the presiding officer and each item shall be concluded before the next item is discussed. Except under unusual circumstances, subject to the direction of the presiding officer, individual members shall have an opportunity to explain fully, without interruption, the particular matters placed on the agenda at his or her request.

Thereafter, and in the following order, the Secretary and public members present shall have an opportunity to comment on the matter in question following which the matter shall be placed on debate or shall be disposed of by motion by the membership. Subject to the direction from the Chair, individual members shall be privileged to ask questions at any time during any part of the discussion. The matter may be debated by the members at any time, either prior or subsequent to a proper motion and second.

Public comments and comments from the Secretary shall be allowed on all motions; provided, however, that any member may at any time move to close the public debate and, if seconded, all further discussion of the matter by the members of the public shall cease and the members shall vote on said motion which, if passed, shall close public debate. Discussion and debate of the original motion may be continued between members until the Chairperson or any other member calls for the question. A call for the question, if seconded, shall immediately end all debate and discussion, and, if said vote carries, the original motion must be voted on without delay. After the formal vote has been taken, all further discussion of the matter shall cease unless appropriate affirmative action follows to place the matter again before the membership for reconsideration.

(2) Adjournment. Adjournment shall occur upon announcement by the chair at the conclusion of business.

11.2 Presiding Officer. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the Councils. In the absence of the Chairperson, a Vice Chairperson shall preside.

The presiding officer may make motions, second motions and debate from the chair subject only
to such limitations of debate as are imposed on all Council members. Such person shall not be deprived of any of the rights and privileges of a member by reason of his acting as the presiding officer. He shall refrain from preempting the floor and shall recognize other members of the meeting in their turn for comment, motion and debate.

The presiding officer shall direct the conduct of meetings within the rules and procedures provided herein and shall preserve order and decorum in all meetings. Such person shall decide all questions of order subject to an appeal by the membership in which a majority vote of the quorum present shall determine conclusively such question or order; shall direct a member or members to carry out the orders and instructions of the chair for the purpose of maintaining order and decorum in the meeting; shall determine the order of discussion and debate, and shall recognize as nearly as possible those individuals desiring to speak in the order in which requests are made to the chair.

If requested to do so by a member, the presiding officer shall explain rulings in connection with any particular point of order and said request shall be referred to the City Attorney and his written opinion shall be returned prior to the next regular meeting. The ruling of the City Attorney shall be final as to the interpretation of the rules may be concerned such interpretation shall be observed by the presiding officer in his orders and conduct of the meeting.

11.3 Appeals. Any member of the Council may appeal a ruling of the presiding officer providing such appeal is made immediately following the ruling to be appealed. In all cases of appeal, the decision of a majority of the quorum shall be final. In the event that appeals are sustained by a majority of the members against rulings or orders of the presiding officer, then, and in that event, the Secretary shall record a notice of such appeal and the action taken with an appropriate notation on the minutes of each meeting concerned.

11.4 Voting. All members shall discharge the responsibility of their elective office and shall vote on all matters coming before them except in those particular cases of conflict of interest in which case a member may request permission and may be authorized to pass his vote upon approval by the presiding officer. Unless a member votes audibly to the contrary or unless a member is granted permission by the presiding officer to pass a vote on a particular matter, silence in voting shall be recorded as an affirmative vote.

Any member shall be entitled to ask for a roll call vote, in which case the presiding officer shall direct the Secretary to poll the individual members in alphabetical order.

Members shall be permitted to qualify or to explain their votes.

Members absent from meetings at the time votes are cast shall not be privileged to cast their vote at a later time although such members shall be privileged to request the Secretary to record them later in the meeting as being for or against the question; providing such request is made during the course of the same meeting with the knowledge of all the members present and with the approval of the presiding officer. Votes cast shall not be changed after a question has been decided and after intervening matters have been placed before the meeting.

11.5 Decorum. During all meetings, elected members shall preserve order and decorum and shall neither by conversation or otherwise delay or interrupt the proceedings or the peace of the meeting nor refuse to obey the orders of the presiding officer or the rules of the Council.

Every member desiring to speak shall address the chair and upon recognition by the presiding officer shall confine remarks to the question under debate and shall avoid all personalities and indecorous language. Every member desiring to question other members, staff, or anyone present at the meeting shall address such questions to the presiding officer, who shall be entitled to either answer such inquiries or to designate some member of the staff or other member for that purpose. All elected Council members shall accord the utmost courtesy to each other, to staff, to public and agency members appearing before the Council and shall refrain at all times from rude and derogatory remarks, abusive comments and statements involving personalities.

Members shall be removed from the meeting for three successive failures to comply with decisions of the presiding officer. If the presiding officer fails to act, any member may move to enforce the rules of censure against the offender.

Except by consent of the majority of the members present, no member shall speak longer than five minutes on a motion at any one time, and not more than once on the same motion until all other members have had an opportunity to speak on the motion.

Members of the Secretary, administrative staff, and employees shall be bound by the same rules of procedure and decorum applicable to elected board members. The City Manager will be responsible for necessary corrective action if violations occur.
Members of the public attending meetings shall also observe the same rules of propriety, decorum, and good conduct.

11.6 Censure. Indecorous action. Improper language and repeated and continued violations of the rulings of the chair shall make any member of the organization, any member of the staff, or any member of the public liable to a voice of censure for such improper action. The presiding officer or any member of the Council may move a vote of censure which, if approved by a majority of the members present, shall be a mandatory direction from the presiding officer to the Secretary as a matter for permanent record in the minutes.

11.7 Expulsion. Any member who is found guilty of indecorous action, in any meeting, shall be dealt with in the following manner: The first censure shall be recorded in the minutes; the second must be accompanied by a written or verbal warning recorded in the minutes indicating possible expulsion; and upon the third censure, the membership of the Council where the action occurs, must vote on expulsion.

Indecorous action of a member must be voted upon at the meeting where such conduct occurs. Before expulsion is final, it must be approved by a two-thirds vote of those eligible members present at that same meeting. The involved party may not vote on the issue.

In the event there is more than one person involved in an indecorous action, each member shall be dealt with individually. Three recorded censures against any member at any time during such person's active membership will result in automatic expulsion.

In the event of an expulsion, the board member(s), should they so choose, may appeal the action to the Board of City Commissioners whose decision shall be final.

11.8 Point of Personal Privilege. Any member shall be permitted to raise a point of personal privilege during the conduct of any meeting except when other matters are before the Council for consideration. Questions of personal privilege shall be limited to:

(a) Requests that specific remarks by an individual be inserted in the record;

(b) Requests for transcripts of specific remarks made at any meeting;

(c) Requests that an explanation of voting be included in the record.

Except under the most unusual circumstances, such requests shall not be disapproved by the presiding officer or by a majority of the members present.

11.9 Points of Order. Any member may raise a point of order at any time, both with respect to the conduct of the meeting, the procedure that is being followed, or any remarks that are being made. Points of order that are raised with respect to rules of procedure shall be ruled on by the presiding officer and be accepted as final unless appealed as indicated by Paragraph 11.3.

Points of order raised with respect to indecorous or improper remarks made by any member, by a member of the administrative staff, or by any member of the public shall be ruled upon immediately by the presiding officer. If such remarks are determined to be out of order, the presiding officer shall instruct the person speaking to cease such remarks and shall instruct the Secretary to delete such remarks from the record and to indicate for the record that such remarks have been deleted as having been ruled out of order. In the event some question arises as to the remarks themselves, the member feeling aggrieved shall be privileged to ask that the remarks either be repeated or be read from the record in which case the presiding officer shall make the appropriate ruling. Such remarks having been ruled upon and declared as out of order, all further remarks in the same vein shall cease immediately. In the event such remarks do not cease, the presiding officer shall be obliged to direct the speaker to terminate any further remarks and, in cases where such action is warranted, shall move to censure the offender.

11.10 Agenda. All meetings shall be conducted in accordance with an approved agenda in order that the members of the Council and the public may be informed as to the matters to be considered and may have an opportunity either to prepare themselves or to be present for such purpose as may be appropriate. The agenda shall be made public in advance of the meeting by dissemination to all news media through the Public Affairs Office of the City and by other appropriate means.

The Secretary shall establish, with concurrence of the Neighborhood Councils and the Central Council, such administrative procedures as will permit the agenda to be mailed to each member not later than the Friday prior to the meeting and to the media upon publication. Additional or supplemental information shall accompany the agenda or shall follow as soon thereafter as practicable. Variations to this schedule as a result of holidays shall be announced in writing.
ARTICLE 12 - ATTENDANCE, VACANCIES

12.1 Attendance. Council members shall attend all meetings unless they are unable to do so because of illness or absence from the City. Members shall be prompt in attendance and those members who are tardy shall not be privileged to review actions taken prior to their arrival. Members shall refrain from absenting themselves from meetings in order to influence voting, to delay business or otherwise to impose restrictions on the members. Members shall advise either the Chairperson or the Secretariat at least 24 hours in advance of their intention to be absent except in the case of illness, when notice may be given immediately prior to the meeting.

12.2 Leaving Meetings. Members shall refrain from coming and going throughout meetings and from unnecessary or undue interruption of the meetings by repeated absences from the bench. Members finding it necessary to leave a meeting before its conclusion shall so state their intent in order that their absence from subsequent voting may be properly noted.

12.3 Excused Absence. Members will be granted an excused absence for reasons of illness or absence from the City if so approved by a majority of the members of the Council. Such action will be recorded in the official record of the meeting by the Secretariat.

12.4 Vacancy. The Secretariat shall report a vacancy to the Council and the Board of City Commissioners.

12.5 Procedure for Declaration of Vacancy. The Secretariat will continually review the record of attendance and when it is determined that a member has missed three consecutive meetings and such absences have not been recorded within the minutes as excused, or has been absent from fifty (50) percent of the meetings of the previous twelve months of that member's term, the Chairperson shall immediately notify the member that his or her seat is vacant and will be filled by appointment by the Board of City Commissioners. This action will not be initiated by the Secretariat until the minutes of the last meeting for which the member did not receive an excused absence are approved.

12.6 Record of Attendance. The Secretariat will maintain for public information an attendance record for all members and will provide such information to any citizen upon request.

ARTICLE 13 - COMPLAINTS

13.1 Complaints Involving Charges of Unfair, Improper, or Inadequate Hearing. All complaints involving charges of unfair hearings or improper hearings or inadequate hearings by a Council shall be referred immediately to the particular Council concerned for a rehearing; provided, however, that such referral shall be accompanied by a written statement from the person complaining of such improper hearing, which statement shall delineate the specific charges in order that the Council may be able to take appropriate action. In the event the complainant is not satisfied by the rehearing, he may bring such complaint before the City Commission as part of the public agenda.

13.2 Complaints Relating to City Operations. Complaints with respect to operations of the City or City Management shall be presented to the Secretariat which shall refer them to the City Manager for appropriate action and report on such action to the Council.

ARTICLE 14 - PROCEDURES FOR PRESENTING MATTERS FOR REVIEW BY THE CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION

14.1 City Administration. Departments of the City responsible for matters listed in Paragraph 6.2 of these Bylaws will present such matters to the office of the City Manager with the notation that Citizen Participation Organization review is required. Such items must be submitted in sufficient time to allow consideration by the appropriate Citizen Participation Council prior to presentation to the Board of City Commissioners. The City Manager will refer all such items to the Secretariat for the Secretariat Agenda of the appropriate Council. In order to assure prompt processing of these matters, the Council must consider the matter and return a recommendation at the meeting during which the matter is scheduled. The Council may request a continuance from the City Manager or City Commission, as appropriate, and the request will be given appropriate consideration. If the Council is unable to agree upon a recommendation, the Secretariat will return the matter to the City Manager for the City Commission Agenda without recommendation, but with the meeting notes reflecting the comments of the Council.

14.2 Citizen Participation Council Matters. Matters initiated by members of a Citizen Participation Council shall be placed on the Council Agenda by the Secretariat at the request of the Council or an individual member of the Council. The sponsoring member(s) will be identified on the agenda. The time limitation set forth in Paragraph 14.1 is not applicable to such items.
14.3 City Commission Referrals. When an item is referred to the Citizen Participation Council by the City Commission, it shall be placed on the Secretariat Agenda for the appropriate Council(s). Unless a response time is specified by the Board of City Commissioners, the time limitation as set forth in Paragraph 14.1 is not applicable to such items.

14.4 Items of City Wide Concern. Any matter affecting more than three Council areas shall first be presented to each appropriate Neighborhood Council and after action by the Neighborhood Council shall be presented to the Central Council for consideration and recommendation to the Board of City Commissioners. The time limitation as presented in Paragraph 14.1 shall apply.

14.5 Items of Individual Council Concern. Those items affecting three or fewer Neighborhood Councils shall be acted upon by the Neighborhood Councils and will not require action by the Central Council. The recommendations or comments of the individual Neighborhood Council(s) shall be presented to the City Commission.

14.6 Presentation of Items to the City Commission. The Secretary will be responsible for forwarding the written comments and recommendations of the Neighborhood Councils and/or the Central Council to the City Commissioners and, when so directed, speak for the Council at Commission meetings to respond to questions of the Commissioners. Individual Council members may also speak to the matter at the time it is considered by the City Commission when so directed by the Council.

ARTICLE 15 - AMENDMENTS TO BYLAWS

15.1 Amendment Proposals. Amendments to these Bylaws may be proposed by the Citizen Participation Council(s), the Secretariat, the City Administration, or the City Commission.

15.2 Procedure for Amendments. Proposals for amendments to the Bylaws shall first be referred to the Neighborhood Councils for recommendation. Recommendations of the Neighborhood Councils shall be considered by the Central Council and a recommendation presented to the Board of City Commissioners.

15.3 Adoption of Amendments. The City Commission may approve or deny the proposed amendment. If approved, the amendment will be entered into the Bylaws and an ordinance adopted amending the Bylaws as provided in the ordinance establishing the Citizen Participation Organization.
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ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING THE CPO

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION  2.60.010–2.60.030

Chapter 2.60
CITIZEN PARTICIPATION ORGANIZATION

Sections:
2.60.010 Created—Membership. There is hereby created a citizen participation organization for the city of Wichita, which shall consist of fifteen neighborhood councils composed of nine members each. (Ord. No. 36-771, (part).)

2.60.020 Neighborhood council—Designation of areas. Neighborhood council areas will be designated by the board of city commissioners not less frequently than once each ten years. Council areas will be divided along the voting precinct boundaries of the city of Wichita as defined by the election commissioner of Sedgwick County. Each council area shall include approximately one-fifteenth of the total population of the city as determined in the last preceding local enumeration. (Ord. No. 34-055, § 2.)

2.60.030 Neighborhood council—Membership—Election—Vacancy. Neighborhood councils shall consist of nine members elected at large from within the council area. The first such election shall be held on the fourth Tuesday in January, 1976. The five persons in each council area receiving the highest number of votes shall be elected to terms to expire April 3, 1979; and the four persons receiving the next highest number of votes shall be elected to terms to expire April 5, 1977.

Thereafter, upon the expiration of the terms stated above, successors shall be elected for a term of four years at the general city election on the first Tuesday in April in each odd numbered year. The first such election shall be April 5, 1977, with succeeding elections each two years thereafter.
In the event there are fewer candidates for election than the number of vacancies on a neighborhood council, the remaining positions on the council shall be filled by appointment by the board of city commissioners. (Ord. No. 34-137, § 1: Ord. No. 34-055, § 3.)

2.60.040 Neighborhood council — Candidates — Filing. Candidates for election from each council area shall be eighteen years of age or older as of the date of election and shall be residents of the council area in which they seek election. No member shall, during the time such person is a member of a neighborhood council, be an employee of the city of Wichita.

Citizens may file as candidates for election by presenting to the city clerk or his authorized representative a petition signed by not less than twenty-five residents of the council area in which election is sought, such signers to be eighteen years of age or older, or by payment of a filing fee of ten dollars to the city clerk or his authorized representative.

The city clerk shall establish such filing places within the quadrants of the city as may be deemed necessary to facilitate filing by candidates for election to neighborhood councils.

The deadline for filing shall be twelve noon on the Tuesday five weeks preceding the first Tuesday in April (Ord. No. 37-889, § 1: Ord. No. 34-055, § 4.)

2.60.050 Neighborhood council — Interim election procedures. The board of city commissioners shall establish such interim election procedures as it may deem advisable for the conduct of the initial election on the fourth Tuesday in January, 1976. Thereafter, voting for election of members of the neighborhood councils shall be conducted concurrently with the general election of the board of city commissioners. (Ord. No. 34-137, § 2: Ord. No. 34-055, § 5.)

2.60.060 Neighborhood council — Oath of office. Upon certification of election by the board of canvassers or the election commissioner the following oath of office will be administered by the city clerk or his designee at a regular meeting of the neighborhood council:

"I.............., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution of the United States, the Constitution of the State of Kansas, and will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of the council representative of the City of Wichita Citizen Participation Organization, so help me God." (Ord. No. 34-666, § 2: Ord. No. 34-055, § 7.)

2.60.070 Neighborhood council — Vacancy — Filling. In the event of a vacancy in the membership of a neighborhood council by reason of resignation, death, change of residence from the council area, or by other reason, the board of city commissioners shall appoint a successor to fill the vacancy until the next regular election and until his successor is elected and qualifies; and if the term of office does not expire at the time of such regular
election, the vacancy shall then be filled at such election for the remainder of the term. (Ord. No. 35-355, § 1: Ord. No. 34-055, § 8.)

2.60.080 Neighborhood council — Election of chairperson. At the first regular meeting following the initial election of neighborhood council members and at the first regular meeting following the first Tuesday in April each year, each neighborhood council shall elect one of its members as chairperson, one of its members as first vice-chairperson, and one of its members as second vice-chairperson. Officers shall serve for a term of one year and successors shall be elected at the first meeting in April each year. (Ord. No. 36-771, (part).)

2.60.110 Chairperson — Duties. The chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the neighborhood council; shall appoint such special committees as may be deemed necessary with the concurrence of the council; and shall sign all documents approved by the council. A vice-chairperson will carry out the functions of the chairperson in the absence of the chairperson. (Ord. No. 36-771, (part).)

2.60.130 City to provide administrative services. The city shall provide administrative services to the neighborhood councils through a citizen participation secretariat. Such secretariat shall consist of a citizen participation coordinator appointed by the city manager with the assistance of a representative body of neighborhood council members, and such other staff members as may be deemed necessary to provide services to the councils. All staff members of the secretariat shall be city employees. Legal services shall be provided through the department of law. The secretariat shall be responsible for preparation of written agenda for each meeting of the neighborhood councils; execution of calls for special meetings; coordination of appearances of city staff representatives as requested by the councils; recording minutes of the meetings; and such other duties as may be assigned by the city manager. (Ord. No. 38-408, § 1.)

2.60.140 Functions and duties. The functions and duties of the citizen participation organization shall be:

(a) To provide for an equitable citizen participation system improving access to governmental decision-making process for all citizens;
(b) To strengthen citizen input in a comprehensive planning program for social and physical development;
(c) To serve as an advisory body to the city commission;
(d) To serve as a continuing source of information from citizens at the neighborhood council level;
(e) To serve as a channel of communication from the city commission and city administration to citizens.

In fulfilling the function of service as an advisory body to the board of city commissioners the citizen participation organization may provide
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recommendations in areas including, but not limited to:

(1) Zoning;
(2) Code enforcement programs;
(3) Physical improvements involving special assessments;
(4) Physical improvements involving relocation;
(5) Location of area service programs such as aged, health, etc.;
(6) Exceptions to rules and ordinances when legal provision is made therefor such as tavern permits, signs, etc.;
(7) The annual operating budget of the city;
(8) The annual capital improvement program;
(9) Federal grants for the poor and disadvantaged;
(10) Budgets for block grant programs such as general revenue sharing and community development;
(11) Matters as shall from time to time be designated by the board of city commissioners.

It is not intended that all such items must be acted upon by the citizen participation organization, but rather that the citizen participation organization may initiate such recommendation as it may deem appropriate from time to time. (Ord. No. 34-055, § 15.)

2.60.150 Responsibilities to commissioners. The neighborhood councils will have the responsibility to advise and recommend to the board of city commissioners as they may deem appropriate on matters within the legislative powers of the city commission. Each council member is responsible to serve as a representative source of information from citizens at the neighborhood level and to serve as a channel of communication from the city administration and the board of city commissioners back to the citizens. (Ord. No. 36-771 (part).)

2.60.160 Limitations on responsibilities. The members of the neighborhood councils will observe the authorities and responsibilities set forth in this chapter. Specifically, the neighborhood councils will act in an advisory capacity to the board of city commissioners on policy matters only.

The citizen participation organization may respond to citizen complaints and contribute suggestions to the board of city commissioners on matters that affect any municipal department of the city and/or classes of city employees as such matters relate to policy. Policy and administrative matters that pertain to an individual employee shall be excluded from general discussion.

The city manager shall, through the citizen participation coordinator, provide such materials and information to the citizen participation councils as will enable them to fulfill their advisory responsibilities. The city manager shall assist in making available to the councils such resource persons from the city staff as may be necessary to assist the councils in their deliberations. (Ord. No. 38-408, § 2.)

2.60.170 Bylaws. Meetings and conduct of members of the citizen
participation organization shall be in accordance with "Bylaws for Citizen Participation Councils," as amended, dated January 23, 1979, which are by reference incorporated in and made a part of this chapter as fully as though set out at length herein. These bylaws shall serve for the conduct of council meetings with the addition of the meeting place and time for each individual council. (Ord. No. 35-903.)

2.60.180 Neighborhood council — Recall of members. Neighborhood council members may be recalled upon the filing of a petition with the secretariat signed by not less than twenty-five percent of the total number of legally qualified electors within the appropriate neighborhood council area, and who voted for that position at the last council election, and upon a finding of cause for removal by the board of city commissioners. Procedures for recall are set forth in full in the Bylaws for Citizen Participation Councils. (Ord. No. 35-671, (part).)

2.60.190 Compensation. All members of the neighborhood councils will serve as a public service to their community without financial compensation. (Ord. No. 36-771, (part).)
APPENDIX C

CPO ACTIVITIES DURING 1981

A. Activities or Items considered by all Councils on a Yearly basis:

1. Community Development Block Grant allocations (CDBG)
2. Capital Improvement Program (CIP)
3. Arterial Sidewalk Program
4. City Budget
5. City's Legislative Program
6. Placement of Lights in High Crime Areas
7. Three or four All-Council meetings that are educational in nature. Topics discussed at these meetings include: The Budgetary Process, The Planning Process, On Health, Redevelopment and Rehabilitation, The MTA, Police-Community Relations, and Traffic Engineering Procedures.

B. Items considered by All Councils during 1981

1. Proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance concerning non-conforming property.
2. Proposed amendments to the zoning ordinance regarding signs.
3. A proposal to require the installation of audio warning signals on refuse collection vehicles.
4. Proposed changes in the Zone Change Notification procedure.
6. A proposed sinking fund to finance capital improvements.
7. A total of 130 zone change requests, and 60 Board of Zoning Appeals requests were considered and recommendations made during 1981.

C. Items related to Physical and Safety Improvements (Individual Councils)

1. Asked for and received curb and gutter repair at various locations.
2. Asked for and received intersection repair at Lincoln and Hydraulic.
3. Requested and received the closing of Kellogg Median at Crestway.
4. Requested and received the re-designing of the intersection at 31st and Seneca.
5. Asked for and received lawn seeding for the Atwater Community Center.
6. Requested maintenance and better signalization at various railroad crossings, such as:
   a) Improving the warning system and the traffic lights synchronization at the 29th and Broadway crossing. (done)
C. Items related to Physical and Safety Improvements  cont.

6. b) Also, requested rubberized railroad crossing at Central and Mount Carmel. (done)
   c) Requested a warning signal at the Rock Road and 17th railroad crossing (scheduled for 1982).

7. A CPO Council worked with Traffic Engineering staff, Park Department, L'Overture School and area businesses to resolve traffic diversion problems in the McAdams Park area (changes were approved by the City Commission).

8. Consistently worked with the residents of the Sheridan Park Neighborhood toward resolving street paving and drainage (drainage project was approved 1-12-82, street paving is pending).

9. Worked with the Department of Operations and Maintenance to resolve a persistent drainage and pothole problem at the intersection of 31st Street South and Richmond.

10. Requested and received two traffic lights at Hoover to the east and Gilda to the west to assist traffic entering on Central.

11. Requested needed street signalization and school crossing signalization, such as: a street light on 21st west of Oliver, a school signal crossing on Central, east of Vassar, and additional lighting on Armour from Douglas to Kellogg.

12. Two CPO Councils have worked with area residents and the Department of Engineering in the Riverside Dam Project and the West 13th Street Drainage Project.

13. Have supported the Jones Park Task Force in its efforts to revitalize the Jones Park Neighborhood. Improvements in the area have included drainage and paving projects, home painting and rehabilitation, clean-up, voluntary demolition and reporting of health code violations.

14. Worked with area businesses, residents and the Department of Engineering to resolve the drainage problem on Woodlawn, from 11th to 13th Streets (improvements are scheduled for Spring of 1982).

15. Requested and received sidewalk on the west side of Hydraulic from Pawnee to Wassal.

16. Requested and received seeding and irrigating of all land along Oliver's north side, from Garvey YMCA to Wassal and railroad Bridge.

17. Sponsored and put together a proposal to build a parking pad paving project. It was approved and funded by the City.

18. Worked with Mayor Knight, the Department of Operation and Maintenance and area residents, to repair the foot bridge on Gypsum Creek. The bridge is used by children from Colvin and Jardine schools.
D. Items related to Social or Public Services (Individual Councils)

1. Organized a Clean-up activity Campaign for the City of Wichita.
2. Organized a Community Clean-up Day along Gypsum Creek.
3. Assisted with clean-up along 21st Street, west of Amidon.
4. Organized a complete clean-up of the Planeview Area.
5. Worked with the Park Department to remove debris from the Little Arkansas River while the Central Avenue Dam is under repair.
6. Reported numerous environmental health code violations and complaints from city residents, including rodents, junk vehicles, debris, air quality, overgrown grass and weed, illegal storage, insect, and garbage dumping.
7. Proposed amendment of City Code to prohibit the placement of handbills on cars parked in public parking areas, to control a nuisance and litter problem.
8. Supported the retention of Minisa and Sweetbriar Libraries.
9. Assisted area residents in applying for emergency and paint grants, and utility assistance program.
10. Served as an information and referral center for area residents.
11. Some Council members volunteered their time for the KPTS/Channel 8 pledge drive and other boards and commissions.
12. Proposed and supported changes and expansion of the Midtown, McAdams, and Atwater Neighborhood to allow for the use of CDBG housing rehabilitation loans and grants for low-income residents and to allow for the use of CDBG funds for street improvements in these areas.

E. Sponsorship of Neighborhood Meetings and Citizen Input (Individual Councils)

1. Worked with the Department of Housing and Economic Development staff to provide greater access for CPO Councils and Neighborhood Associations in the planning of redevelopment projects in the Midtown and Riverside Neighborhoods.
2. Sponsored neighborhood meetings with the Mayor.
3. Sponsored neighborhood meetings on:
   a) the Callahan-Westpoint Sanitary Sewer
   b) the reconstruction of Ridge Road from Maple to Newell
   c) the commercial development proposed for Webb Road from Douglas to Kellogg
4. At the request of area businesses, got a realigned portion of Ridge Road at Maple and Kellogg re-named Mid Continent Road.
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#### CPO RECOMMENDATIONS OF CDBG ALLOCATIONS, BY COUNCIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Midtown Alcoholic Rehabilitation Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residential Drug Abuse Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drug Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adult Drug Education &amp; Prevention Techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drug Abuse Research &amp; Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Services to Minority &amp; Disadvantaged Contractors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Big Sisters Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meals on Wheels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moving Pantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bookmobile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sanitation Collection Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Child Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Perpetual Help Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Institutional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Secondary Schools Math &amp; Reading Tutorial Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cultural Enrichment at Mid-Way Houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Educational Guidance Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 7th Step American Business Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planned Parenthood Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Services to Residents of One &amp; Two Bed Care Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Handicapped Softball Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Women's Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD CENTERS &amp; SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Westlink Branch Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planview Center Health Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Planview Center - Recreation Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Services Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Youth Recreation &amp; Cultural Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Northeast Day Care Learning Ctr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Information System for Human Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eureka Community Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNING ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Public Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Test Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Alternates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Energy Planning Contingencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neighborhood Planning - MPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Neighborhood Planning - CPO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage Study - South Seneca Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Drainage Study - Midland Valley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATION - OPERATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Urban Renewal Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Contracts Administration &amp; Evaluation (includes CDBG Audit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Administrative Charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wichita Child Day Care Assoc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CITIZEN PARTICIPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CPO Administrative Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City Commission Broadcasts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Genealogical Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rehabilitation of Center for the Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Environmental Assessment for Cogasification Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Rehabilitation - Lewis Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Renovation - Buildings &amp; Grounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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URBAN RENEWAL - TYPE ACTIVITIES, HOUSING REHABILITATION, HISTORIC PRESERVATION

- East Douglas Area
- Downtown Landscaping Demonstration
- Commercial Rehabilitation Loan
- Central Industrial Corridor
- West Bank Area
- Midtown Activity Area (URA)
- Midtown Entry Features
- Heritage Square Extension
- Fairmount Activity Area (URA)
- Fairmount Activity Area
- Old Town Activity Area
- Riverside Activity Area
- Riverside Activity Area (RCA)
- Broadway Acquisition
- CD Land Inventory Operations & Disposition
- RD P Land Inventory Interest Cost
- Planning & Management Development
- Transportation Center
- Black Historical Site
- Cowtown Smoke Detection
- Murdock House Restoration
- Administration of Historic Landmark Process
- Heritage Square
- Housing Rehabilitation Projects
- Home Insulation Program
- Housing Improvement Program
- Creative Housing Demonstration
- Institute of Logoeics

PUBLIC WORKS, PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Channel Construction - Dry Creek
- Planview Parking Court Paving
- Menossee/Jones' Park Addition - Drainage & Street Paving
- Cutler Repaving
- Gas Utility - Betterments & Improvements
- Construction of Public Improvements to Induce Residential
  Development & Reduce Urban Sprawl
- Curb & Gutter - Spot Reconstruction
- Curb & Gutter Reconstruction
- Third Street Drainage - Right-of-Way
- McLean Boulevard - Right-of-Way
- Street Name Sign Replacement

PARKS, RECREATION, OPEN SPACE

- Park Projects
- Land Acquisition - Southwest Wichita
- West Kellogg Tree Planting

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIERS

- Cowtown Walkways/Restrooms for the Handicapped
- Cowtown Street Lighting

FIRE PROTECTION

- Fire Apparatus Replacement
- Microfiche Retrieval Display
- IFSTA Manuals
- Firefighters Physical Fitness Facility
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MAP OF CPQ AREAS

NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL BOUNDARIES

CENTRAL
KELLOGG
HARRY
Pawnee
MacArthur
47 th St. S.
55 th St. S.
63 rd St. S.
NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1 = CPO
2 = CDBG Intent and Objectives
3 = Social Work Theory and Goals
4 = Community Development Description
5 = Democratic Ideology Paradigm
6 = Social Reform Paradigm
7 = Antipoverty Models (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions b</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td>Advisory</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coalition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership:</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appointed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex-Officio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-Selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization:</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Representation:</td>
<td>Population-as-a-whole</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low-Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Local Government:</td>
<td>Autonomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When two or more choices for a given dimension are marked by "X", it indicates that all or any can apply.

Dimensions here are slightly different than those discussed in Chapter V, due to comparison considerations.

Figure 2
DIMENSIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CPO AND SELECTED OTHER ENTITIES AND CONCEPTS
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NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = CP0</th>
<th>2 = CDBG Intent and Objectives</th>
<th>3 = Social Work Theory and Goals</th>
<th>4 = Community Development Description</th>
<th>5 = Democratic Ideology Paradigm</th>
<th>6 = Social Reform Paradigm</th>
<th>7 = Antipoverty Models (Actual)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Concern:</td>
<td>Specific Program</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Responsibility:</td>
<td>Program Operation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy Influence</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Units:</td>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Areas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Whom Director Reports:</td>
<td>Top City Official</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C.P. Body</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Where Citizens Involved:</td>
<td>Proposal Development</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and comment</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval in Final Form</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aWhen two or more choices for a given dimension are marked by "X", it indicates that all or any can apply.

^bDimensions here are slightly different than those discussed in Chapter V, due to comparison considerations.
NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1=CP0
2=CDBG Intent and Objectives
3=Social Work Theory and Goals
4=Community Development Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Citizen Roles:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Dominance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Dominance</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redistribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Participants:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Planning Approach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incrementalist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Membership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elitest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)When two or more choices for a given dimension are marked by "X", it indicates that all or any can apply.

\(^b\)Dimensions here are slightly different than those discussed in Chapter V, due to comparison considerations.
NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1=CP0
2=CDBG Intent and Objectives
3=Social Work Theory and Goals
4=Community Development Description

5=Democratic Ideology Paradigm
6=Social Reform Paradigm
7=Antipoverty Models (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions b</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Conception:</td>
<td>Elitest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pluralist</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness:</td>
<td>Gross</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Integration:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Participation:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Emphasis:</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Function:</td>
<td>Technician</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabler</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a When two or more choices for a given dimension are marked by "X", it indicates that all or any can apply.

b Dimensions here are slightly different than those discussed in Chapter V, due to comparison considerations.
NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1=CP0
2=CDBG Intent and Objectives
3=Social Work Theory and Goals
4=Community Development Description
5=Democratic Ideology Paradigm
6=Social Reform Paradigm
7=Antipoverty Models (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation: Advocacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition-Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation: Processual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Poverty: Material Shortage</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Deficiency</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Malfunction</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universalistic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particularistic</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Emphasis: Social Services</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Change: Individual</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization: High</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When two or more choices for a given dimension are marked by "X", it indicates that all or any can apply.

Dimensions here are slightly different than those discussed in Chapter V, due to comparison considerations.
NOTE: Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1=CDBG Intent and Objective  4=Democratic Ideology Paradigm
2=Social Work Theory and Goals  5=Social Reform Paradigm
3=Community Development Description  6=Antipoverty Models (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entities and Concepts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralization</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Representation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship to Local Government</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope of Concern</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Responsibility</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Units</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Whom Director Responsible</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Citizens Involved</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff/Citizen Roles</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Participants</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Planning Approach</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Membership</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Interest Conception</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^A=Agrees  D=Disagrees  M-Mixed (Partial Agreement)
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### Figure 3—Continued

**NOTE:** Numbers on horizontal columns designate headings as follows:

1 = CDBG Intent and Objective  
2 = Social Work Theory and Goals  
3 = Community Development Description  
4 = Democratic Ideology Paradigm  
5 = Social Reform Paradigm  
6 = Antipoverty Models (Actual)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entities and Concepts</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Process (Continued)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Integration</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Participation</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination Emphasis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Function</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Orientation</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Orientation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Product</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View of Poverty</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Emphasis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Change</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalization</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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